

Christian Faith and Life

Combining The Bible Champion and The Essentialist

Volume 42

JANUARY, 1936

Number 1

EDITORIAL

Stages of Revelation

IN its strictest meaning, revelation is divinely imparted knowledge concerning the personality and nature of God, the laws of moral obligation, the means of human redemption, and the final glorification of redeemed men in the heavenlies. The impartation of this knowledge has gone on in accordance with the normal emergences of human history, and stands both as the incitant and the registry of what has been highest in world consciousness.

That revelation has been progressive from the beginning is manifest in the record of Scripture, which is the sole repository of finished inspiration. The most marked stages of development in the divine revelation are such as may be classified thus: The various stages of formal statement, of enlarging content, of coalescence of parts, and of canonical arrangement.

It is not only true that the record of revelation in the Scriptures exhibits the stage of its beginning, but also that it suggests subsidiary standards of completion and settlement. However, no utterance or injunction of revelation was ever made conditional or dependent. From the beginning, the Word was yea and amen. Yet very many of the early Scripture mandates carried, or had respect to, the element of time and relationship: Others, by reason of human infirmities, or the environment of human conditions, temporarily suspended, not the essence of truth and righteous-

ness, but the judgments inherent in the verities of law and ideal.

Perhaps it would be theologically more correct to say that, in such exigencies, the Scriptures reflect the long suffering of Jehovah in dealing with the limitations of man's knowledge. Concerning an age of incomplete revelation, St. Paul says: "The times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent."

The above announced principle is supported by many facts of Scripture. Monogamous marriage, for instance, was fixed at the beginning of the creation in the moral and spiritual order of the universe; and yet, in the time of their "ignorance," revelation did not pass by the polygamous patriarchs whose faith was counted to them for righteousness. Slowly but surely, a moral light deepened into spiritual light, revelation perfected and emphasized the ideal of marriage and set it forth as the symbol of the relation between Christ and His Church. Thus have the Scripture standards of all human contact been brought into enduring light.

In a very important sense, the formal record of revelation has progressed through stages of enlargement and completeness. There were goals in ancient prophecy, culminations at which finality was reached and proclaimed in the "burdens" of anointed seers. The familiar and challenging, "Thus saith the Lord," described the end of seasons of personal

struggle in the soul of the prophet, and of factual movements of the Spirit in the affairs of men. The oracles of Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel coincide with related crises in the national life of Israel. The burdens of the lesser prophets are equally the stories of men and times.

If both the reverent minded Bible student and the critic of a prejudged objective would recognize this fact, sounder and more beneficial results would come from Scripture interpretation. Historical and temporal elements in ancient life became channels for the movement of the Holy Ghost who spake through the lips of holy men. It was a startling discovery made by the scholars of a former generation, all but completely obsessed of the old higher criticism, that the fetich of their delusion was grounded in a radical misapprehension of Bible history and fact.

Not infrequently, in studying the prophecies and historical books of the Old Testament are we impressed that other writings of a similar character preceded those that are found in the canon, or that those given us are compressed by the writers themselves from originals of larger compass. This in no wise minimizes the divineness of the revelation, but rather enhances its practicable quality by taking account of that human cooperation which has always found recognition in the plan of the divine ongoing.

Preferential continuity, determined from the human side of authorship, may account for no small sections of the historical and meditative books of the Bible. References in certain of these books to the annals of Jasher, and citations from other Israelitish chronicles than those found in the canon, illustrate what this continuity might be.

A general spirit of inspiration has attended the intellectual advance of the race, which has come chiefly in the way of ethical illumination; but special and canonical inspiration has come in the way of selective and finally settled statement and precept. It has been not incorrectly assumed that many heathen phil-

osophers and teachers of the past enjoyed a degree of divine inspiration; and, indeed, fragments of their thinking have been endorsed into written Scripture; but the finalities of the Word have come, and could only come, through the instant and emphatic endorsement of the Spirit. This view of inspiration has elucidation in the words of the Psalmist: "Thy word is true from the beginning; and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth forever."

Revelation attached not only to the original authorship of the books of Scripture, but also to the labors of those devout men of later eras to whom the Spirit gave the task of preserving and canonically relating them. Whoever wrote the biographical addendum to the book of Deuteronomy (it could not have been Moses) was equally inspired with Moses who wrote the book in its original form. It is also quite clear that the concluding verses of the book of Joshua were written by a hand other than that which compiled the preceding chapters, but a hand not less ordered of the Spirit. There is no logical grounds for denying to Joshua the authorship of the book which bears his name. On the contrary, every canon of proof points to that conclusion. The subscript must, therefore, fall to a progressive record.

It seems certain that the several parts of the prophecy of Jeremiah were put together and related by means of *nexi* and footnotes at the hand of Baruch, a princely friend and the amanuensis of the prophet. Those parts which might be shown to be *Baruchian* are not less inspired than the prophet's own work. The Spirit chose his own time and his own way in completing and preserving the anthology of the weeping preacher of the court of Zedekiah. Such is the verity and sanctity of revelation in its every period and relationship that its utterances validate each other in their order.

It has often been asked: "How did the canon of the Scriptures come to be formed, and who selected and validated the books of the Bible?" The best answer to this question is that the canon formed

itself, and that the books of the Bible were validated through many stages of test and accretion, each stage revealing an active and determinative direction of the Spirit. The power which ordained the writing of the Word has guarded its fortunes through all the changes of time. This observation applies not only to the contents of the several books as finally settled, but also to their association together in a conforming unity.

Between the return of the people of Israel from exile in Babylon and the fourth century before Christ, the Jewish priests and scribes passed in some wise upon the books of the Old Testament, and sought to determine what was to be accepted as having the authority of Scripture. It is not now clear how this cooperation was conducted; but there is a tradition concerning a Sanhedrin of rabbis to whom this task was assigned. The dispensation of prophecy was at an end, and the law and the testimonies of history had long settled into form. A divine assessment of time was in reserve to bring the parts into a final unity.

The Septuagint, a Greek translation of the Old Testament by Jewish priests, near the beginning of the third century before Christ, shows how far from our present notion of Scripture were many of the sections of that compilation. It did indeed contain what we know as the Old Testament; but it was distressed with numerous apocryphal, uncanonical and foreign inclusions and unscriptural citations. However, in the last national period of Israel this was practically the only Bible known to the common people. It was well known to our Lord and his early disciples. A majority of the quotations from the Old Testament found in the New are from the Septuagint.

With the coming in of the New Testament canon, and its settlement in the Christian communities of the third century, the Old Testament books had assumed, providentially and historically, their present familiar count and relationship. When, finally, the German and English Reformation came to pass on "the lively oracles," the task was simply

to accept the verdict of providence and history and eliminate the Tridentine absurdity of the Apocrypha, the leaving the self-attested canon as we have it today. It is neither a conceit of rashness, nor a boast of ecclesiastical partizanism to say that the German-English settlement of the canon represented the last and final stage of the self development of Bible revelation.

In connection with what has been said above concerning the coalescence of certain forms of early revelation an effective stricture on modern destructive criticism is developed. This stricture comes of the progressive record of revelation over which the critics so grievously stumbled. Bible scholars now know that the stories of creation, the garden of Eden, the fall of man, and the *toledoths*, or genealogies of the patriarchs, were derived by Moses from written records preserved in the Abrahamic family from early post-diluvian times.

Was it the possession of those writings in Ur of the Chaldees that awoke the family of Terah from the nightmare of Sumerian idolatry and set the faces of father and son toward the land of Canaan and the oracle of Elberith at Shechem? These writings were a certified revelation in their own order; but they gave beginning to a new and intensified stage of inspiration in the works of Moses.

Several times heretofore I have spoken of the fact that a dependable archæological light leads to the belief that the Book of Genesis was written by Moses at Kadesh, or Midian, where he was co-priest with Jethro of that shrine, and where were laid up priceless calendrical records, brought by Abraham out of Ur of the Chaldees, as recited above, these records having been transferred by the Habiri, the increment of the camp of Abraham-Isaac-Jacob, from the hinterland of Beersheba, where they were left by Jacob at the time of his departure into Egypt.

The presence of a Levitical priesthood at Kadesh in the middle of the second millennium before Christ is well attested,

and points directly to the refugee, Moses. The Abrahamic records were used by Moses with but slight alteration from their original form, thus making the spirit of revelation one and inseparable through the ages.

Edouard Naville, the Egyptologist, near the beginning of the present century, announced that he was prepared to sponsor the hypothesis that Moses wrote the several books of the Pentateuch on cuneiform tablets, at widely separated times, and under varying conditions, and then collected the tablets into a whole.

This was a gesture in the right direction; but needs to be reinforced with another. The Abraham tablets, containing the items of an earlier revelation, were written under various moods of composition, and in varying styles of expression, and thus brought into Moses' writings paragraphical changes and sudden transitions into new forms and stylistic peculiarities. The business of Moses was to preserve the originality and straightforwardness of these documents, which were a valid revelation in themselves.

It is interesting to note how this understanding of the use in the Pentateuch of a pre-Mosaic revelation, preserved in peculiarities of form and style, meets and overthrows, as we have observed above, the chief hypothesis of higher criticism, namely, that of alleged later "source" origins of the Pentateuch. This hypothesis makes the book of Deuteronomy the earliest of the Pentateuchal writings, at about 600 B. C. The other four Mosaic volumes are given dates a century later, and are derived from the writings of unidentified prophet schools. It was this burden of proof that sank the Source hypothesis within the century of its launching. The sources from which Moses wrote were millenniums older than either Abraham or Moses; and were a revelation before the age of either.

The process of the critics was inverted. If, instead of seeking to prove that a later cosmogony had been created

by the exilic, and near exilic, prophets and bespoken in the name of Moses, they had sought to account for differentials in the early Genesis stories through their having come from a pre-Mosaic source, they had fallen on the line which future Bible science is to follow to illumination and honor.

Hävernick, a well known Hebraist of the last century, who fully accepted the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, was first among Bible scholars to give prominence to the "mood" theory in accounting for compositional variations in the Genesis writings. Thus the different appellative groups of *Elohim*, *Jehovah* and *Jehovah Elohim*, which by the Wellhausen school were attributed to the mixed authorship of later prophets and priests, were by Hävernick explained as the results of varying mental moods of Moses who wrote from different angles of impulse, and different times. A half century ago this explanation was cordially welcomed by orthodox scholars, who saw in it a probable solution; but its utility disappears in the presence of the new accepted fact of the use by Moses of the Abrahamic documents brought from Ur and Haran.

The acceptance by scholars of the theory of an extensive pre-Mosaic writing, having the value of a divine revelation, was, at first, qualified by a large measure of inference; but the discovery in Mesopotamia, chiefly within the last sixty years, of near a hundred thousand cuneiform clay tablets, with other records, many of them going back to periods beyond the age of Abraham, and dealing with subjects kindred to the Mosaic cosmogony and beginning, has changed inference into certitude and confidence. Direct revelation was active in the very ancient world; and a traditional record of it was a natural sequence. It is now known with certainty that Abraham *could have possessed* copies of these records; it is also now vastly more than an inference that he *did* possess such, and that *they were* preserved in the Beersheba-Kadesh hinterland until the time of Moses.

Thus it can be seen how the use by Moses of sections of an older and validated revelation illustrates a primary stage of inspirational coalescence, and rationally and logically widens the field of written Scripture. Quite consistently, it may be asked: "What is the evidence or canon for the inspirational integrity of these Abrahamic documents?" Exactly the same as that which validates the original compositions of Moses. Their use by Moses gives them endorsement as being *Scripture*, and in their own unaltered form they speak an autonomous testimony.

We may now make a brief application of the principle of progressive revelation to the books of the New Testament. From the writings of the Church Fa-

thers, as well as from internal and comparative evidence, we find ourselves safe in accepting the book of Mark as the original Gospel. It is also certain that Mark's Gospel, at first known as the Memoirs of St. Peter, was immediately reduced from the preaching of St. Peter himself. Mark's message, being of such character, was recognized as an authoritative standard. But, being only a *synopsis* of the Galilean story and teaching, other evangelists were, later, led to use its matter and fill up the hiatuses of its recital, thus continuing and completing the record. But in the new canon, as in the old, that which has come to completeness and finality is altogether of the Spirit's utterance.—H. M. DuB.

What Bible Christians Must Believe

What we Must Believe Concerning Jesus Christ.
Who Was He? Whence Came He? What did He do?

This is the third of a series of editorials by Dr. Conrad. The fourth editorial will appear in our next issue.—ED.

A. Jesus Christ the Son of God and God The Son

ALL of our knowledge concerning Jesus Christ is from three sources: first, the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; secondly, tradition; and thirdly, Christian experience.

The factual features of the life of Christ are secured from just one source,—The Bible.

A Messianic hope pervades the entire Old Testament Scriptures. Mosaic history, Mosaic revelation, Levitic ritual, Hebrew poetry, Hebrew prophecy, all have as the burden of their teaching the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Critics who rule out the predictive element from Old Testament prophecy do so arbitrarily and with no warrant of any kind.

God's search for man to restore him to Divine favor began the very instant he violated God's Will and asserted his own will as supreme. Immediately God

announced that He Himself would solve the great problem of restoration. The method of this achievement is indicated in the promise of victory over the serpent who represented the principle of evil and the cause of the fall of man. "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head" was the declaration of God Almighty. All subsequent revelation seemed to have as the burden of its purpose the unfolding of the meaning of this Divine promise. It was clearly declared that remission of sins could only come through the shedding of blood. The whole Levitical ritual was a type of which Christ was the anti-type. Very particularly in the prophecies of men inspired of God, and the Hebrew poets who were given an insight into the mysteries of redemption centuries before Christ came to accomplish it, foretell in detail the nature of Christ's coming and of His suffering.

How any one can place the 53rd chapter of Isaiah beside the Cross and not see that the two represent an identical purpose of God is hard to understand.

The Virgin Birth of Christ and His perfect life together with His death are unfolded with such clarity and decisiveness that the people of Israel were held together generation after generation by a vision of the Messiah to be.

In the New Testament we have a definite record of the coming of Christ, the teaching of Christ, the death of Christ and the resurrection of Christ. The Synoptic Gospels occupy a very considerable space in a description of the Supernatural Birth of Jesus. They leave no doubt as to their own intent in proclaiming Christ's birth as a definitely supernatural act. A rejection of the Virgin Birth of Christ if consistently followed results in the rejection of the credibility, integrity and authenticity of all of the Synoptic Gospels.

All the great facts relative to Jesus Christ depend upon our acceptance of these Gospels. Furthermore, no one part of the Gospel is better authenticated than any other part. Whoever, therefore, denies the Virgin Birth may with equal propriety and we may say of necessity throw doubts upon the reliability of the whole narrative. The Synoptic Gospels, Matthew, Mark and Luke, declare in the most unmistakable terms that Jesus Christ was born of the Virgin Mary. The fourth Gospel is more metaphysical and more introspective and deals with the Person and Nature of Jesus Christ. While the first three Gospels present to us all the facts regarding Christ's miraculous birth, the fourth Gospel declares His pre-existence, His supernatural power and makes it clear that Christ was not a mere product of the human race. Our thought of Jesus as to His origin takes us straight to the declaration of the Creed, "Conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary."

Christians not only have every ground and reason to believe in the truths of these statements as revealed in God's Word, but every consideration of consistency compels them to believe it.

Jesus lived a human life, mingled

among men with freedom, yet by His conduct and teaching and indeed His definite statements He represented Himself as unique and peculiar in His relation to God.

Nothing could be more definite than Christ's own identification of Himself with the Father, "I and My Father are one." This statement has to be wrested entirely from its true meaning, if it is interpreted as meaning anything other than identity of Essence between the Father and the Son.

Christ's entire life was a continuous outpouring of His Nature in sympathetic serviceableness. He evidenced a familiarity with spiritual realities which no ordinary man ever pretended to enjoy. He spoke with a finality of declaration which clearly implied that He regarded Himself as final authority in all matters pertaining to the spiritual life of man. He clearly implied that there was no court of appeal beyond Him.

Jesus was perfectly at home with the most abstruse spiritual problems. When occasion required He did not hesitate to employ His Power in supernatural ways which the Bible calls miracles.

Christ met sickness and death and showed His mastery over both. His noble and miraculous efforts were always benevolent in purpose, never with demonstrativeness and never to gratify curiosity.

Despite all of the work Jesus did, notwithstanding His marvelous sympathy, His gentleness, His goodness, His superlative teaching, His mission was ignored and He Himself rejected by the very people to whom He addressed Himself and His message. His enemies made a travesty of law, were barbarous in their persecution and finally hung Him to a Cross. He had Himself foretold these very events and knew full well to what depths of ignominy and shame His enemies would drive Him. It was His voluntary choice to accept all this in the interests of the salvation of the human race.

With the same distinctness and defi-

whiteness which pertains to His Birth and teaching and His death, we have the account of His resurrection from the dead.

Of such immense importance was the fact of His Resurrection, that all that could be done both natural and supernatural was done to put this event beyond the shadow of a doubt.

To make the Resurrection of Jesus a Resurrection of soul and not of body, is to make the whole account ridiculous. The Resurrection becomes a sham and a delusion except it is received precisely as stated. Not a hint anywhere obtains that Christ's Resurrection was other than the Resurrection of the very body that went into the Tomb. To disbelieve here places one outside the pale of what the Bible designates as a real Christian. Such a person distinctly classes himself with unbelievers. He divests himself of any worthwhile message to give to the world since he has no assured faith in the Gospel at all, hence no well accredited knowledge regarding Jesus of Nazareth. It is strange that intelligent men do not see that they must believe in the Gospels as we have them, or put themselves entirely outside the pale of accredited and commissioned witnesses for Jesus Christ. By no distortion of words or doctrine can you find any place for the great, redemptive mission of Jesus when you deny either His Virgin Birth or His Resurrection. A real follower of Christ *must* accept Christ's declarations regarding Himself at their face value. No one can deny, who is able to interpret language at all, that Jesus clearly predicted His own Resurrection. A real Disciple of Jesus will receive these facts with enthusiasm and supreme satisfaction. The distortion of language employed to get rid of the Virgin Birth, the Atonement and Resurrection, only reveal the utter perversity of the human heart. We should rather be seeking for every available evidence that our faith in these great facts might never waver.

The death of Jesus Christ upon the Cross was climacteric so far as His hu-

man life was concerned but His Resurrection became the real basis for the establishment of Christianity and the founding of the Christian Church.

As an indispensable fact in order to the fulfilment of a redemptive mission, the sinlessness of Christ is clearly taught and must be unquestionably accepted. He certainly created the impression of His inner knowledge of His own absolute holiness. This, then, is the historical account of Jesus which as Christians we must believe and teach.

No historic fact known to man is more worthy of confidence than these same marvelous and authenticated facts regarding Jesus Christ.

What then do we understand to be the mission of this Divine Man? Nothing less than His own declaration of that mission. "I am come that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly."

"The Son of Man is come not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give His life a ransom for many."

The Supernatural Witness to the mission of Jesus was given at His baptism when a voice from the spirit world said, "Behold the Lamb of God Who taketh away the sins of the world." He came into this world, then, as a Redeemer, as a Saviour. Jesus declared Himself to be "The propitiation for our sins and not for ours only but for the whole world." He is the unspeakable gift. Whose gift? God's gift to a sinful world. He is the fullest Divine expression of the saving purpose of the Infinite God.

The salvation which Jesus came to effect is not a figurative or fanciful salvation, but a very real one. He saves us not only from the guilt of sin, but from the love of sinning. He removes our transgressions by making us one with Himself.

Christ was God manifest in the flesh. He was God manifesting Himself savingly for a lost world. All of this He still is and ever will be.

The Deity of Jesus Christ is as real as is the Deity of the Father.

Christ is Infinitely Lovely and Infinitely Lovable.

The richest of all human experiences is the experience of daily fellowship with Jesus Christ. His promises never fail us. His friendship abides unceasingly. His love never grows cold. He is equal to every problem and every emergency of our individual lives.

Doubts destroy the peace and soul-satisfaction which God wants us to enjoy. There is not an atom of real ground for disbelief in Jesus Christ or in anything He said.

Christian experience marvelously corroborates every Bible declaration regarding the application of Christ's atoning work to our own souls.

No expectations go unfulfilled where faith in Jesus is complete. Our outlook in life is completely changed when we turn away from the world with its allurements to Jesus Christ as our Saviour and Inspirer. Nothing is more practical than Christianity when it is genuine and full, but a fractional Christianity is a failure.—A. Z. C.

The Church of Christ in the World

Matthew 16:18

This address was delivered on October first at Princeton Theological Seminary, introducing the season lectures before the student body for the years 1935-36. The series on the Future Life will be continued beginning with the next issue of CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE.—Ed.

THERE is a group of men within the total multitude of the race who are peculiarly God's own. The purpose of God for the ages centers in these personalities. They are the men and women who have opened their lives to the infinite by faith. They are men and women who in the act of faith have chosen to build their lives upon the foundation of the infinite and the sublime. These men and women He calls *My Church*.

This church is not co-extensive with the historical institution we know by that name; nor did it begin, as that institution did, at the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. This *Church* is as old as creation, but it became manifest at the resurrection; in which stupendous event all life seems to have felt the touch of a creative force of vast expansiveness.

If I have read history aright the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead is, above all other values, the effective cause of that remarkable advance in civilization which has characterized the past two thousand years. Let me summarize its creative efficiency:

The Resurrection first gave solidity to the race's dim hope for immortality.

The Resurrection first disclosed transcendent life, life that corresponded to and fulfilled the aspirations of the soul.

The Resurrection has gathered into a visible organization those men and women who have chosen to believe in the infinite and sublime and to build their lives upon it.

Finally, the Resurrection has inspired men with a new confidence toward life. It has been thus a vastly expansive influence which has energized men and so produced the remarkable increase of the Christian centuries both in knowledge, in invention and in political freedom.

Nor can the truth of these statements be denied: for it is simply a fact that political freedom, the varied expressions of the soul in art, the progress of scientific culture and the general level of human well being, have been most advanced in precisely those lands where the Gospel of the Risen Christ has been most effectively preached. There are even yet no non-Christian free governments; and the contribution of pagan countries to the advance of science is almost negligible.

If some one should raise the question as to the advance of science in atheistic Russia, I would reply: It is far too early

to discuss Russia's contribution to the advance of civilization. The nation has experienced a certain expansiveness in its new outlook upon life that has been stimulating; but there is no certainty that this stimulation will endure. The fact is that atheism is a frightfully depressing outlook. It will take small men, indeed, to feel an enduring enthusiasm for life when it is seen as bounded by the cradle and the grave. I venture this prophecy: When the benumbing heaviness of death's awful hopelessness and violence has settled down upon the soul of Russia all progress will terminate, and swift disintegration will set in.

The Creative Value of Faith in the Infinite

Let me repeat, now, for emphasis. The purpose of God centers not in mere men; but only in those men and women who have chosen to believe in and to build their lives upon the truth of the infinite and sublime, and upon the infinite and sublime as now historically manifest in Jesus Christ and His Resurrection from the dead.

And how reasonable this is! If a man does not believe in the best literature, but reads instead vulgar authors, does he not lose the best? If a man does not believe in the best art and music, but seeks satisfaction in some gaudy show or exciting clamor, does he not again lose the best?

And is it not the same with the man who does not believe in the infinite and the sublime, but chooses to live in the little? He ignores all the glory of Christ and all the expansiveness of His Resurrection. He lives in sense and greed and excitement. He allows all his nobler powers to atrophy. I say, is it not reasonable, is it not inevitable that he should lose the sublimities he has chosen to ignore?

After all the one inclusive sin is just living little. It is the choice of little self that ignores the race; the choice of little time that ignores eternity; the choice of little wilfulness that ignores the all-inclusiveness of the will of God. No man

can live little and be a son of God. Yes, littleness is the very genius of sin, and unbelief is the chief spring of all littleness.

It is unbelief that robs men in one stroke of all sublimity. It is unbelief that puts a bound upon every outreaching of the soul. Unbelief abolishes eternity, drains all majesty out of truth, and blights with futility and wormwood the beauty of love. The conclusion is unescapable: since unbelief de-humanizes men, unbelief must also damn their souls.

But faith, on the contrary, is inevitably creative. To believe in the infinities of one's aspiring soul, and in those infinities as now historically manifested in Jesus and His Resurrection from the dead is of necessity to feel one's life expanded. The rise of faith in these sublimities is to the soul of man like the touch of spring upon the winter drab of nature. The beginning of faith is indeed the spring time of the soul. Those who believe must inevitably become the royalty of the race. Yes; the purpose of God centers in such men and women. They are His Church.

The Church

The Church then is a believing organization. It promotes faith. It is confident that the springs of life are through faith. It knows that life must be inspired if it is to achieve, that some expansive force must play upon it: and it knows that there is no other sure spring of expansiveness save only faith in the infinite. The Church sees faith in the infinite as the master achievement of any life. It sees that here, more than anywhere else, destinies are won. It is therefore set for the promotion of faith. It seeks to lead men outside the limiting littleness and failure, that is so constantly true of all human experience, into the presence of those twin immensities: the infinities of man's aspiring soul, and the infinities of the fact of Christ.

We glimpse now these two immensities for a moment. Undeniably the life of man has upon it the impress of the

infinite. Even such an enthusiastic unbeliever as Prof. Leuba admits that religion and the thirst for immortality are substantially universal. What, then, is this sense of the infinite which we so universally experience? I think I can analyze five values here.

1. Man longs for life that transcends the limitation and violence of death.

2. Man longs for character that will fulfill the utmost demand of conscience.

3. Man longs for love and joy that will fulfill all his dream of romance.

4. Man longs for truth that will explain and justify all the mystery of being.

5. Man longs for contact with that vast unseen Infinite, whose existence both his reason and heart attest.

This is the soul of man, and these intuitive aspirings of his soul have made him universally a religious being. He must have the infinite, the abiding, the perfect; and when he rises to believe that there is in life an answer for all these longings he experiences an expanded consciousness; he experiences that exaltation of heart which is so necessary to creative living.

Such a confidence in the truth of man's inner aspirings was the one dim light in all pagan centuries. So Socrates and Plato believed, and even Abraham and David had but little more. The world before Jesus and the Resurrection was but little lighted. No wonder their funeral institution was an organized wailing.

But at last it was God's fulness of time. The Divine invaded the universe. The Infinite came within the finite, and revealed Himself to finite. God's eternal Son stood in the human flesh vividly out there in the midst of the years. Here at last was the answer. Here at last was life as big as the aspirings of man's soul. It is transcendent Christ. And it is precisely His transcendence that is most significant. If one should reduce Jesus to our human size, he might, indeed, make Him more understandable, but he would rob Him of all significance.

It is His transcendence that makes Him significant. It is because He surpasses us that He fulfills us. The reduced Jesus of naturalistic criticism is powerless to help men. It is the transcendent Jesus of the New Testament who is creative.

What a portrait it is! Prophet foretold; Virgin born; Final in truth; Almighty in power; Loving unto death; and Victorious over the grave. This is the Christ who fulfills us. This is the Christ that we need.

Man's aspiring soul! The transcendent Christ, who fulfills us! And then one-third value. It is disclosed within the second. It is the fact that the transcendent Christ, who fulfills us, is also one who lifts us ourselves to fulfillment. Jesus is more than God's perfect man, He is also man's perfect Saviour; and to witness this whole truth is the mission of the Church; to believe it is humanity's one open highway into destiny.

Now I think we are in a position to seize the whole rich value of the Christian Church. It is indeed a society which promotes faith in the infinite and sublime: but its particular accent is upon the infinite and sublime made manifest in Jesus Christ, in whom we behold not only the perfecting of the race but also a redemptive force adequate to lift the race into perfection.

This is the supreme mission of the Church: To bear everlasting witness to the total adequacy of God in Christ to meet every human need. The truth here is manifold, but it has three chief elements, namely:

1. The adequacy of the divine almightiness made manifest in the Resurrection of Christ from the dead.

2. The adequacy of the divine redemption, made manifest in Christ's cross.

3. The adequacy of the divine self-revelation consummated in Christ's life and teaching.

The Adequacy of the Divine Almightiness

I was conversing one day upon the evidences of the New Testament miracle, and my companion said: Why

trouble about miracles? In a theistic universe they have no significance, for the power of God is far more majestically manifest in the forces of nature itself. I replied: It is not the mere majesty of the divine power I need to know. I need to know also that His power is in definite correspondence with my utter helplessness.

And this is the incomparable value of the truth of the Resurrection. It shows us the divine omnipotence in correspondence with human need at just the point where human need is most desperate.

When I stood watching my father die I felt my own awful weakness and futility. I would have given my own life to have restored him; and all I could do was to stand and watch the progress of his dissolution. As I stood there that night I did not want to know that the power of God could swing Orion or create the cosmic ray. What I wanted to know was that the power of God could and would intervene for me in this tragedy of death, and bring immortal life out of the tomb.

Precisely this is what I have in Christ's Resurrection from the dead. I see the devastating weakness and futility of my death ended in the resurgence of His life. I know the silence of my tomb broken in His Resurrection shout. I am certain that the omnipotence of God is working at the point of my extreme weakness, of my utter need. I hail immortal life.

Yes, it is not mere omnipotence that I want but omnipotence in correspondence with my need: and this is what I have in Christ's Resurrection.

Paul could never get over wondering at Christ's Resurrection. For him that was the manifestation of omnipotence par excellence. To him the greatest contrast he had ever experienced was that between the humiliation and weakness of Christ upon the Cross and the glory of His resurrection life as it was made manifest in blinding splendor on that Damascus road.

The power that wrought this transformation was the omnipotence of God; and his life's one all sufficient confidence was that this same power would work in him to lift him free from a like weakness and humiliation, transforming him into the same glory.

This confidence is the chief spring of expansiveness in the Christian faith. It changed paganism's constant dirge into the exaltation of the apostolic shout. It replaced paganism's epitaph of despair, "Farewell forever," into Christianity's glorious hope.

No wonder Peter shouted, "Blessed be God, who hath begotten us again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." And no wonder from the beginning of that shout forward the ages have been increasingly new.

Easter's Shout

Vast rending of the purple Easter morn
Though inarticulate, thou speakest sure:
For now no more can death, with pall of night,
Enshroud the souls of men. Thy gloom is done!
Thy strength is gone! The Son of God thy bars
Hath rent! His might hath burst thine ancient bounds,
And leaping high atop the whole vast frame
Of forces, law and worlds, cried back to man,
Behold, O child of fear, thy destiny!

And us who hear, He bids to lift His cry.
Our praise, the echo of His Easter shout,
He wills to flow, redeeming, down the years.
Tis thus, through us, He binds the broken heart,
And wipes from blinded eyes, their scalding tears.
At last He'll be fulfilled; life find its goal;
Creation answer to His promise fair;
Easter become the law; life tower complete;
And man immortal stand, God's utmost work.
Creation's summit, and redemption's crown.

The Adequacy of the Divine Redeemerhood

After the tragic futility of death, the race's next problem is its oppressing sense of guilt. One of the most illuminating experiences of my life was once when a sin-burdened man said to me, "I hate your doctrine of forgiveness. I have sinned and wrought havoc into half a score of lives, and I would despise both God and the universe if I could just be sorry and start all over again."

My brethren, there is truth in that sinner's words. Forgiveness is an immense moral problem: and the Cross is not only necessary to God's righteousness but also to the sinner's own morally quickened heart.

Here are three conceptions of forgiveness: (a) An unconditioned forgiveness of all sin. (b) A forgiveness of sin only where an effective repentance has warranted it. (c) A forgiveness of sin that is universal and yet at the same time morally conditioned; but in which the moral conditions have been fully met from the divine side in one tremendous forth-utterance at once of His Holy Judgment and of His Redeeming Love.

Only this third provision for forgiveness is adequate for human need; and it is this third which the Church brings to men in its witness to Jesus Christ and His redeeming Cross—at once the achievement and the forth-utterance of the divine redemptive adequacy.

The Adequacy of the Divine Truth

We need deliverance from death. We need deliverance from sin. And, then, finally, we need truth to live by. Here also the manifestation of God in Christ is adequate.

Christ is final. And every Christian must so hold Him; for, if our confidence in Him is conditioned by any other higher confidence whatsoever, we will have lost Him.

I say it deliberately. We Christian men and women must put the authority of our Christ above both that of our sciences and of our universities. In that sphere of truth in which Jesus speaks He must stand fully absolute.

Modern preaching has often failed because it has been defective at precisely this point. One of the characteristics of the so-called "modernism" was its spirit of uncertainty. I remember some years ago when a ministerial friend, who should be described more as a confused intellect than as a modernist, said to me: "The thing that annoys me about you is that you are sure of your truth. You

claim to have truth, while I am only in quest of it."

My brethren, preaching that is only in quest of truth will never save the world. Living is tremendously serious business. It concerns life and death, time and eternity, judgment and destiny; and men cannot be playing with uncertainties when the issues are so stupendous.

There are indeed spheres in which certainty is not necessary to us. I am content to wait for the physical sciences to bring me the detail truths both about chemistry, physics and biology. I have never thought of turning to Christ for these things. I have never even assumed to find a scientific chronology in the Scriptures. But in the sphere of the soul, of beginnings, of duty, of redemption, and of destiny I must have a sure word; and I can own no man as Lord and Saviour save one who has spoken such a word.

This is the finality of the mind of Jesus which is the third of those essential elements in the Church's witness to its Divine Christ, and to the adequacy of God in Christ to meet every human need.

The Church in the Midst of the World

Yes, this is the Church, a congregation of men and women who have felt the majestic aspirations of their own souls, who have seen in Christ not only the fulfillment of those aspirations, but a power adequate to lift them, themselves into fulfillment, and who are set to bear witness to Him. From the morning of the Resurrection forward this Church has been an expansive force in the midst of the world. It has acted upon the world, and the world in turn has reacted upon it. Its witness and life has changed the face of history; while the human forces of history operating about it have at times advanced its goals, and at times retarded them. And so whether for advantage or disadvantage, the Church is in the midst of the world, both affecting, and being affected by world conditions.

During recent years the world has been most disadvantageously affecting the Church. It has been hostile to it in the very innermost principle of its life, and the Church has shown a dangerous willingness to compromise. For example, the world's naturalism has challenged the Church's supernaturalism. The world's self-sufficiency has been offended by the Church's self-distrust and message of salvation. The world's objective pre-occupation and rushing excitement has produced a state of mind that, because of its very superficiality, has been inhospitable to the Church's profounder truth.

But these things are all changing today; and the Church is facing the future in a new intellectual atmosphere. There are signs on every hand of the beginnings of a new spiritual movement upon a vast scale.

New Discoveries

In the first place new discoveries in science have so modified our current conception of the universe as quite to unfound the recent hostility to the supernaturalists of the Gospel. Science affirms today no longer a mechanistic but a manifold universe. At the bottom of the scale of being is fortuity. Above this, where being is in ponderable mass, is a mechanistic order. Still higher is human freedom and the moral order. If the universe is thus manifold and includes both fortuity at the bottom and moral freedom at the top (which presupposes transcendence) it is idle, out of mere hostility to that transcendence, to deny the miracles of Jesus.

In the second place new discoveries in archæology and history are steadily accrediting the Christian witness. It is amazing to how great an extent the whole Biblical record is now historically accredited. For example: Jesus Christ is a fact. His death upon the Cross is a fact. His open empty sepulchre is a fact. The death despising devotion of His first witnesses is a fact. The first generation origin of the Gospels is a fact. We do not believe these things; we know

them. These values all stand out like mountain peaks upon the horizons of life. The believer and the unbeliever alike must accept them, and reckon with them in constructing their philosophy of life.

Then in the third place Christian experience is just as much a scientific value as either biological or physical experience. It is just as certain that Charles Finney experienced the touch of the Infinite when praying alone in the New York state woods as it is that the sun attracts the earth by gravitational force varying directly according to the mass and inversely according to the square of the distance between the two bodies. The denial of the Biblical revelation is simply a narrow and prejudiced judgment, for aspiring hearts are still experiencing divine revelations today. These current divine self-disclosures may not have the world significance which those had which came through Isaiah, St. John, and St. Paul, but they are just as supernatural. Lewis saw the risen Christ and that is why he wrote his *Manifesto*. Olin Alfred Curtis had a revelation of Christ on the hills at Marburg, Germany, and it became his volume, *The Christian Faith*. All conversion is an immediate touch of God, and the spiritual poverty of certain learned men, who are ignorant of this experience, no more discredits the experience than the impoverished life of some precise old maid would discredit the wonder of romance or the glory of motherhood.

In the fourth place, the New Testament record of Jesus has the power to satisfy enduringly the heart of humanity. Men cannot face the gospel portrait of Jesus without wishing that they might indeed find Him the very truth. Whether we be believers or unbelievers, if we be men who live, we must feel the incomparable sublimity of the New Testament's transcendent Christ and adore Him just as an idea, even though we deny His reality.

I walked one day with a young woman, whose mind had been deeply in-

fluenced by the still current prejudice against the supernatural. She said to me, "I cannot believe in Jesus. Miracles are impossible in my universe." I replied, "In view of the circumstances that you feel you cannot believe in Jesus' reality, let us undertake to do this with His portrait, let us seek to improve upon it until we have made Him quite perfect by the standard of our own inner aspirations and ideals." And then we started; and for half an hour we tried to improve the New Testament record. We raised the question of removing His miracles. We faced those words of moral sternness and flaming ethical demand that sometimes seem so in contrast with the grace of Jesus. At last we faced His redeeming Cross and victorious Resurrection; and to every question of change my friend said, "No, leave Him as He is. I like Him better that way." At last she seemed to appreciate the beauty of the whole portrait and cried, "I cannot improve Him. He is perfect. If I am to believe in Him at all I want Him just as He is."

And her conclusion is inevitably the conclusion of all earnest hearts who sincerely face the realities of life. Jesus is utterly beautiful. He is the classic of the centuries. That mind and heart would be defective which could find in Him a flaw, or desire to make a change.

Then, finally, the world is moving, and its very movement is forcing a new emphasis upon ethical and religious values.

Both the progress of science, and of scientifically grounded invention is forcing life to move. Take two circumstances. First, war has become so frightfully destructive, that its very blight commands the race to seek a higher ethical plane, or face the possibility of extinction. Second, the multiplication of machinery has so increased production that the economic law of supply and demand is disorganized, distribution rather than production has become the chief problem of organized society, and for

its economic salvation the race is again compelled to seek a higher ethical plane.

These problems are pressing upon men's hearts. The shallow jazz age is rapidly passing. Men have been suffering, and because they have been suffering they have once again discovered the realities of life. The period of self-assertion and of idle revolt is past. Life is groping, confused, but wistful.

This is, as I see it, the present world situation, and the present intellectual atmosphere; and it is big with significance for the human race, and big also with opportunity of high redemptive service for the Christian Church.

Conclusion

What, then, is the conclusion? It can be but one thing: A clarion call to recommit ourselves to Christ and to the witness of Him. Let us possess ourselves of the majesty of His fact. Let us renew our heart's rest in Him. Let us make Him our truth. Let us look for His guiding hand daily all about us in our way of life. Let us renew every morning our realization of His complete adequacy for life in its totality. Let us consecrate ourselves to the rebuilding of His worship, recognizing that the only effective witness to His truth is a worshiping and victorious Church. Let us do these things regardless of what other men may do. Let us do them, not as though we made a sacrifice, but as recognizing that in doing these things and believing these things we have found the way of life.

Yes, the purpose of God centers not in men but in His Church—that multitude of men and women who have chosen to believe in the infinite and sublime, and build their lives upon it. Against this Church the supreme resource of evil shall never be able to prevail. It may be tried, but it never will be overborne; and to it, and those who are of it, belongs at last the glory of the final purpose of the Triune God, when all the little pride of men has been lost amid the waste of years.—H. P. S.

The Alphabet of Science and the Word of God

"C"

IN continuing this subject which was begun in the July issue of *CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE*, we are reluctantly forced to epitomize and condense these presentations far more than we had anticipated doing when the series was planned. The subject is so nearly inexhaustible, and the material so unlimited, that we cannot cover the subject with anything like completeness, and we must stop somewhere. Every fresh discovery of science, every new fact that research uncovers, as well as every new field that the explorer enters, all add fresh material to the mass of evidence already marshalled in support of the Word of God. So in as concise a manner as is possible, and without attempting to bring the discussion to a complete termination, we will continue in this issue by saying:

"C" is for Cytology

We might just as well have said chemistry, or conchology, or crystallography, or any other of the sciences that begin with the letter "C." For just as surely as the marvelous structure of the crystals, that are all formed mathematically in obedience to established laws, offers a teleological evidence of creation, so does the exact science of chemistry give an evidence of God and His Creation of the physical world. The choice falls upon the more recent science of cytology, however, because of an experience of a student in a classroom in a medical college more than a score of years ago.

This young man, lead to a knowledge of the saving grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, while still a senior in medical college, found himself in instant disfavor with a certain professor who was

rabid in his antagonism to the Bible and all things that are connected with the Christian faith. On every occasion, upon entering the classroom, the professor would single out this converted student and make him the butt of his ill-conceived humor. The teacher would generally start the conversation by saying, "Do you still believe the Bible?" Entering into the humor of the situation, the young man, who was partly Irish, would reply, "Yes, doctor, I believe the Bible, but I am not being still about it." The professor would say, "How can you expect to be a man of science and believe the Bible?" The student invariably replied, "Why not?" which gave the professor his opening. In very dogmatic terms, he would assert, "No man of science can believe the Bible because of the number of scientific errors and contradictions the Bible contains." The young man would close this customary sparring match for an opening by saying, "Will you please name one?" whereupon the professor would name what he believed to be a scientific error in the Bible. The young man would return to his apartments and look up the so-called error, and in every case he found that the Bible was right and the professor was wrong! This continued long enough to turn this medical student from medicine to the ministry, and he is still preaching the Gospel today.

On one of those classroom occasions, the professor, after his customary introduction, referred to a gross scientific error that Paul had made in the fifteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians. Being asked to state the reference, the doctor referred to 1 Corinthians 15:39, "All flesh is not the same flesh: but there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of

beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds." After this quotation, to the delight of the balance of the class, the following brief debate took place.

The student replied to the citation by saying, "But, doctor, I believe that Paul the Apostle was right. There *is* a basic difference between the flesh of all species." In some surprise, the professor said, "Have you come this far in your studies, and have you not yet learned the continuity theory?" "Oh, yes," the young man said, "I have learned the continuity *theory*, but I am not giving up my faith in the Bible for a theory. What I desire is fact." The instructor replied, "But the continuity theory is fact. There is a continuity of life by gradual emergence. Every living creature is composed of cells. These cells have, as their basic structure, protoplasm. All protoplasm is the same. Therefore, all life is the same, and the theory of evolution is established, to the utter disrepute of the creationist theory, by the presence of protoplasm in all cells." The young man answered by saying, "I am sure that there *must* be a basic difference between the protoplasm of one species and that of another." The doctor was content with saying, "Prove it." (The student body, somewhat irreverently, had named him "Prove-it Brooks," as this was his favorite retort.) Without any hesitation, the young man said, "But, doctor, I don't have to prove it. You yourself admit it is true. When the lunch hour comes, if you go down to the Palace Hotel and order quail on toast, and they serve you stewed codfish, you will object in a tone loud enough to be heard halfway across the bay of San Francisco." In some chagrin, the doctor asked, "But what does that prove?" "That simply proves," said the student, "that if your appetite can discern the difference between pork and lamb, fish and fowl, there must be a basic difference, and we apparently have more sense in our stomach than we have in our head." Amid the laughter of the class, the debate ended, as such debates generally did, with neither party satisfied.

We have often wished that the good doctor were alive today. This occurred in the archaic days of biology, a score of years ago, before the modern technique of cytological research gave us a real science of differentiation. It is possible today to determine the difference between fragmentary specimens of any living creatures, by a scientific technique that we may safely call infallible. If the reader should bring into a laboratory equipped for research in cytology, five specimens of flesh, or skin, or blood, or bone, either alive or dead, and should ask for the nature of each specimen, it would be a comparatively simple problem. No matter how old or dried the blood may be, nor how desiccated or putrid had become the material that once was alive, an able cytologist would require about fifteen minutes to each specimen to determine its species. It is possible to tell inerrantly the difference between a horse and a cow, a goat and a sheep, a canary and a parrot, or a man and an animal.

We would not make this article technical, for fear of confusing those to whom laboratory procedure is strange, but we would like to suggest some of the steps used in this differentiation. The Parke Davis Laboratories, which have contributed some of the greatest reagents and aids to pharmaceutical knowledge, have recently produced a chemical reagent called simply the "anti-human precipitin". If a specimen of living matter, or dead matter that had been alive, is placed in the test tube and this reagent added, we get an almost instant reaction that says, "This is animal," or "This is human." If the reaction shows the specimen to be of some animal, then there are steps to be followed that show what kind of an animal it is. On the other hand, if the reaction shows the specimen to be human, that is as far as science can go. There is no known technique that will tell the difference between the blood, or the flesh, or the bone, or the skin, or the neural structure, of any two races of human beings. (Apparently Paul was equally right when he said,

"God hath made of one every race that dwells upon the face of this earth.")

At one time, the cell was an unexplored continent. In recent years, however, men of daring and genius have ventured to explore this once unknown land. Starting with the protoplasm, we find that all protoplasm is not the same. There is a different chemic formula for the protoplasm of every different species. The protoplasm of one species will segregate and contain, for instance, a different group of proteins than the protoplasm of another.

Of equal importance with the protoplasm, there is a section of the cell called the cytoplasm. This jelly-like mass contains an amazing and active particle called the "Apparatus Golgi." Whether this is an organism or an organization, is not at this time known, but we do know that this Apparatus Golgi is in ceaseless motion as long as life is in the cell. The path that is traveled within the protoplasm by the Apparatus Golgi differs in all species, but in every case is somatic to each species. Thus, when we have charted the path that the Apparatus Golgi travels in the cells of the dog family, we never find this life-time traveller departing from that path in the cells of any dog. The same is true of the cat, the simian, the horse, or the human. Having then charted by species the fluctuations of Apparatus Golgi, the trained cytologist, by consulting his charts or his memory, can quickly determine in the living structure, the exact species he is dealing with.

By a modified osmic acid technique, Apparatus Golgi may be dissolved from the cytoplasm, and with this clew to start with, it is possible that we may soon solve the mystery and the function of this amazingly microscopic indicator. In like manner, the centrosomes, the chromosomes, and all other sections of the heterogeneous composition called the cell, are subject to differentiating indicators that cry aloud the truth of the statement of Paul the Apostle. Man is no more an animal than a canary bird is a fish, and some day text-books, which

are generally ten years behind research, will recognize this fact. It strikes us as an unusual example of crass ignorance for men to speak of "man and the other animals," when there is a chemical reagent that will tell almost at a glance that man does differ from the animal.

Another great aid to species differentiation is the almost magical instrument called the spectroscope. All the old conclusions of relationship between species, based upon the famous blood precipitation tests, have been utterly discredited by this more scientific technique. Instead of separating the blood and using only one portion of its complex content, as is done in the precipitation tests, the spectroscope uses the whole and entire blood. As the rays of light pass through the blood and are divided on the prism of the spectroscope, they all but shout "Amen" to Paul the Apostle, who eighteen hundred years ago anticipated the discoveries of this twentieth century instrument, when he said, "There is a different kind of cell structure for every genus."

Of course, this is kindergarten science to the trained laboratory technician of the twentieth century. Surrounded by complex instruments more marvelous than Aladdin's fabled lantern, the man of science has been given enlarged vision that enables him to think after God the thoughts of the very technique of creation. If all cytology were boiled down to one simple statement, we believe it could be put in these words, "All flesh is not the same flesh."

If the Bible is not inspired, how did Paul the Apostle know this fact eighteen hundred years before science discovered it? Lacking as he did, any of the modern equipment of scientific research, we could explain the marvelous accuracy of Paul on one basis and one only. As Paul took up his pen to write the fifteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians, he dipped that pen in the ink of inspiration, and the Spirit of God Almighty revealed, through his writing, wisdom that we are just discovering today.—H. R.

Notes on the Auburn Affirmation

WE hope that our readers will read Professor John V. Stephens' article on "The Auburn Affirmation" in this number of *CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE*. This article, of course, throws additional light on the situation in the Presbyterian Church.

Note that the pronouncement of the General Assembly respecting the five "essential doctrines" was made at the convention of 1923. Now Prof. Stephens informs us that at the next convention in 1924, which was predominantly a conservative body, the moderator appointed a committee, composed of conservatives, to examine the Auburn Affirmation and bring a report before the Assembly. The said committee "recommended that no action be taken." Says Dr. Stephens: "The Assembly with apparent unanimity adopted the report of the committee."

Here some remarks seem to be both pertinent and necessary. The said action—or, rather, non-action—of the General Assembly of 1924 is a most surprising one. To our mind, it is almost unbelievable to think that a conservative church body would adopt such a report, and vote for no action to be taken. But the fact helps to account for the troubles—serious ones, too—now agitating the Presbyterian Church. Had the Assembly dealt firmly and stalwartly with the un-Biblical statements of the Auburn Affirmation, the situation today might be very different. We do not claim the ability to say just what should have been done by the members of the Assembly of 1924, but we do think they might have at least asserted that the declarations of the Assembly of 1923 on the five points were in accordance with the teaching of the Holy Scriptures and the Presbyterian confessions, and that the statements of the Affirmation were, for the most part, contrary thereto. By such a pronouncement the Assembly would have taken a firm and unmistakable

position. For any one should be able to see that most of the statements in the Auburn Affirmation are of either a dubious or a liberalistic character.

It will be seen that Dr. Stephens' article does not deal with the real merits of the question at issue. That question is this: Is the Auburn Affirmation an evangelical document or a heretical one? We hold that it is the latter, and we believe that we showed this to be true in our article in the October number of this magazine. There we showed that the five doctrines which the General Assembly called "essential doctrines" are Biblically based, and are facts, not mere "theories". Let us look at them again for a moment.

The plenary inspiration of the Bible is both Scriptural and confessional. If it is only a "theory," as the Affirmants hold, we beg to know what other "theory" of divine inspiration is in accord with the Scriptures and the Westminster Confession. The doctrine of the virgin birth of Christ is taught in the Bible as plain as a, b, c. If it is only a "theory," what other "theory" agrees with the teaching of the Holy Scriptures? The same contention holds good with regard to the atonement, the resurrection of our Lord and His miracles. All of them are Biblical doctrines. Therefore they are facts, not "theories". To call them "theories" when they are clearly Biblical doctrines, is not evangelical, but modernistic.

Our friend, Dr. Stephens, published the substance of his article in the *Presbyterian Banner* for September 12, 1935—a journal which is decidedly modernistic. Its editor, Dr. James H. Snowden, sides with the Modernists, as we know from his book, *Old Faith and New Knowledge*, published in 1928. This editor adds some comments of his own which throw additional light on the situation in the Presbyterian Church. We give the gist of his statements.

He says that in 1925 a Special Commission of Fifteen was appointed to report to the next convention of the General Assembly on the Auburn Affirmation. The next Assembly (1926) declared, through the said commission, that "the Assemblies of 1910, 1916 and 1923 had no authority to pass resolutions attempting to make certain 'five points' of their own wording 'essential doctrines' of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., and that there is an area of toleration in the framing of these doctrines." To be exact, we will now quote further from Dr. Snowden's editorial:

The cry that is still kept up by a small group that the Auburn Affirmation is a heretical document falls flat in the face of the fact stated in the above communication by Dr. Stephens, that the conservative Assembly of 1924, with Dr. Clarence E. Macartney as moderator, committed the matter of the Auburn Affirmation to the committee on Bills and Overtures. Dr. Macartney as moderator appointed Dr. Maitland Alexander as chairman of the committee, and Mr. William J. Bryan was also a member of it. Yet this super-orthodox committee "recommended that no action be taken" on the Auburn Affirmation. In the light of these facts, it may be truthfully asserted that the Assembly of 1924, through its committee on Bills and Overtures, refused to take any action against the Auburn Affirmation, and also that the Assembly of 1926, in adopting the report of the Special Commission of Fifteen, put its express sanction on this Auburn Affirmation.

This is certainly a significant statement. What does it prove? Nothing on the real merits of the question at issue. It rather proves what a hold Modernism had already gained on the Presbyterian Church in 1926. And why do we draw this damaging inference? Because the said Auburn Affirmation is plainly modernistic to the core. Just sit down and analyze it, and see if any other conclusion is possible. In calling the clearly revealed Biblical doctrines of the divine inspiration of the Bible, the virgin birth of Christ, His atonement, His bodily resurrection and His miracles only "theories," the signers of the Affirmation clearly put themselves on the side of the Modernists. Suppose we think the matter through and see if it is not so.

The editor of the *Presbyterian Banner* adds the following ungenerous remarks concerning those who question the orthodoxy of the Auburn Affirmation:

Time was (that), when the brains were out, the man would die, and the same is true of an alleged cause or charge; but these brethren have changed this, and are defying this biological law. In charity we must suppose that they are either ignorant of these facts themselves, or else are presuming on the ignorance of other men.

We consider that a very ungracious observation. Moreover, it is not a true allegation concerning such scholarly men as Drs. Wilson (Robert Dick), Machen, Allis, Van Til, Craig, McIntire, Griffiths, and other men of like caliber. It certainly cannot be successfully alleged that these men's "brains are out." We have no desire to reply to Dr. Snowden in kind; yet we feel impelled to say, as suavely as we can, that, if there is any obtuseness anywhere, it may well be applied to those persons who cannot see that the Auburn Affirmation is a heretical document. Surely men who deny the "five points" of 1923 cannot rightly be called evangelical. Let our readers who are interested in this debate review the pronouncements of the Affirmation, as they stand in our article in the October number of this magazine, and judge for themselves whether they will stand the evangelical test.—L. S. K.

Our Ministry

I Kings 17:13

Paul said: "I magnify my office"; that is my ministry. Elijah was called to the brook. He went, though it looked like a poor place for support. When the brook became dry, he was called to Zarepath, a still harder outlook for a living. If he had been looking for a soft, easy charge, how he would have murmured to the bishop! Elijah knew that the Heavenly Father made His appointments, though he took cheerfully the hardest places in the kingdom. Like Paul, he endured hardships and was able to accomplish great achievements, strengthened by the Almighty arm.

Comments on Topics of the Times

PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, M.A., D.D.

Christ the Messiah

BY going back to the Hebrew or Aramaic, much light is cast upon many New Testament passages. Take, for example, Peter's great confession in reply to our Lord's question, "Who say ye that I am?" Undoubtedly Christ and His disciples were talking in the Hebrew dialect of their day; therefore this would be the proper form of Peter's statement: "Thou art the Messiah, the Son of the living God." How significant! Peter was a Jew, and he here acknowledged that Christ was the Messiah predicted in the Old Testament. And remember, Christ commended Peter's answer, and declared that the Father in heaven had indited it. The same is true of what is said of Apollos in Acts 18:28: "For he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Messiah." Of course, the Greek (*Christos*) means the same as Messiah, but how much more luminous the passages seem to be when we translate them according to the Hebrew form!

The Old and New Testaments

THE phrasing of Peter's confession as given in the preceding paragraph is full of meaning from the fact that it binds together the Old Testament teaching and dispensation with the New. It means that Jesus was the promised Messiah of the Old Testament. And this fact received the sanction of Christ Himself when He commended Peter for his confession, by saying to him, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona." Here again we have our Lord's endorsement of the Old Testament. The Bible is an organism, a living whole, having one and the same source throughout, namely, plenary divine inspiration. The New is seminally contained in the Old, and the Old is wonderfully fulfilled in the New. This view agrees with 2 Tim. 3:16 and 2 Pet. 1:18-21.

A Vigorous Protest Movement

WHAT is known as the Evolution Protest Movement, which we have previously noticed in these columns, is moving along apace in England, Canada, and other countries. It is being sponsored by a number of leading scientists among whom may be mentioned Sir Ambrose Fleming, Douglas Dewar, O. R. Acworth, and W. Bell Dawson. Enthusiastic meetings have already been held, and more are being planned. The Movement also circulates much literature of a scientific character, showing just why the theory of evolution should not be taught as a scientifically established fact. People in America who want to know more about this important Movement should address the Secretary, Evolution Protest Movement, 24 Essex Street, Strand, London, W.C.2, England.

A New Organization

ATENTION is hereby called to a new organization which has been started here in the United States, and which bids fair to be of much service to the cause of truth. Its name is, "The Religion and Science Association." The second article of its constitution reads as follows: "The purpose of this association shall be to investigate various problems in their relation to religious belief, particularly their relation to the Holy Scriptures, and to make public the findings of such investigation." The society is specifically opposed to the theory of evolution, but will give it fair treatment from the scientific viewpoint. Among the sponsors of the said association we note the following: Prof. George McCready Price, D. J. Whitney, Byron C. Nelson, Prof. Theodore Graebner, Prof. L. Allen Higley—all of whom are engaged in scientific research, and firmly believe that true science and Biblical teaching are in accord. For further information address Dudley J. Whitney,

Secretary-Treasurer, Exeter, California. Dr. Higley, of Wheaton College, is the President.

Whence Came Religion?

A NEW book bearing the title, *The Origin of Religion*, by Dr. Samuel M. Zwemer, is published by the Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn. The price is \$2.00. We have not received the book, but an announcement of the publishers pleases us so much that we want to share it with our readers, who will be pleased with its solid evangelical and scientific position:

In this fascinating study of the origin of religion, Dr. Zwemer is in accord with many great British and Continental scholars on these important subjects: Religion came by revelation, not as a result of an evolutionary process; God revealed Himself to man in creation; monotheism preceded polytheism; the evidence of faith, hope and charity in primitive religion which can only be explained by primitive revelation; belief in the immortality of the soul is so universal among primitives and in nearly all the ethnic religions that this other-worldly character of man's religious outlook is also proof of primitive revelation. . . . Here is a wealth of well-organized material hitherto available only in many books.

Lutheran Day in Germany

A GREAT Lutheran meeting was held the last July in Hanover, Germany. Lutheran clergy and laity attended from all parts of the Reich. The testimony to Christ and the Bible was clear and emphatic. Bishop Meiser, of Munich, the chairman, voiced the general consensus of the meeting in his concluding message when he said:

Therefore, above all, let us pray that we may have the Word! Constitution, regulation, liturgy and discipline can be lacking, yet thousands will be saved if the Word abides. Everything depends on the Word. We cannot do without it. There can be no forgiveness, no peace in life, no hope in death, no blessedness in heaven—no prayer here, no hallelujah there—if we do not have the Word. Unconditionally we pray to have the Word. For the Word we would sacrifice all else. . . . That is worth more than the Episcopacy, more than the Succession—it is the source of all good and the death of all vanities. Lord, keep us steadfast in Thy Word.

Emil Brunner's "The Mediator"

WE have not read this work, *The Mediator*, by Dr. Emil Brunner. It has not been sent to us for review, and it is too expensive to buy (\$6.50). An extended and acute review of it appears in the last number of *Bibliotheca Sacra*. The book receives praise from Canon J. K. Mozley and Dr. H. R. Mackintosh. These commendations create a good deal of surprise, coming from such sources. From the said reviewer we learn some saddening facts concerning Dr. Brunner's theological attitude. According to our reviewer, Brunner treats the doctrine of the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures with "outspoken scorn." The Virgin Birth of Christ, with all its Biblical references, meets only with a "sarcastic dismissal." Brunner is guilty of "the complete dematerializing of the resurrection of Jesus Christ." To quote Brunner directly, he says of Christ's resurrection, "but not the resurrection of the material substance of which the body is composed." Thus, while Brunner seems to be evangelical in some ways, especially on the doctrine of sin, he is quite modernistic in other respects. The more's the pity!

Defense Still Needed

IT must not be thought by evangelical believers that the time has come when we can "stack arms," and cease upholding the Christian faith in its integrity. No, indeed! Here comes along Dr. Bruce Curry with his book, *Speaking for Religion*, in which the usual superior claims are made and the wonted "assured results" are repeated. Here is a typical excerpt (p.33): "But this 'old time religion' is made well-nigh impossible, since scientific findings such as evolution have rocked the pillars of the older world-view, and since Biblical criticism has shaken belief in the external and final authority of the Bible." We are wondering whether Dr. Curry has not read or heard of the many up-to-date books that have shown the scientific weakness of the evolution theory and the

fallacies of the negative Biblical criticism. We would recommend to his notice Sir Ambrose Fleming's and Douglas Dewar's recent books on evolution and W. T. Piltner's convincing work on the Pentateuch. To evangelical believers we would urgently say: This is no time for doctrinal indifferentism!

Still More Light

OUR editorial on the Auburn Affirmation in another part of this magazine will, we think, be revealing. Still further light comes to us on the situation in the Presbyterian Church. A writer, who signs himself "Anxious Pastor," contributed a letter headed "Unwholesome Literature" to the *Presbyterian* for Oct. 3, 1935. He tells us what he finds in a quarterly magazine for young people in that denomination. The readers of the said quarterly are referred to many books for additional reading on the various topics discussed. Many of the authors recommended are known to be modernistic. There is scarcely an author in the list who is known as a real outstanding conservative. In the recommended list we find the following well-known Modernists: Willard L. Sperry, William E. Hocking, William P. Merrill, Nicholas M. Butler, Kirby Page, B. H. Streeter, Henry L. Wieman, Ralph W. Sockman, William R. Inge. Does not this list cast additional light on the situation in the said denomination?

Here is Still More Evidence

THE said "Anxious Pastor" gives us still further information. In the student's book there is a lesson on "marrying the right person." Two lists of qualifications are given. One is of men rating women as desirable mates in marriage. Says the writer: "There *character* appears as qualification number one, while 'interest in religion' is listed as number thirteen. In the list for men rating women, 'health' appears as number one, and 'religious compatibility,' as it is called, the only reference to religion,

appears as number twelve, coming after 'business ability' and 'personal neatness.'" Is it any wonder there is trouble in Zion? Even the young people are to be infected with modernism.

Winona School of Theology

WINONA LAKE School of Theology in 1935 enjoyed an attendance increase over the preceding year of 60 per cent. There were twenty-three denominations represented in the student body also seventeen states, besides one foreign country. The 1936 Session is to be held from July 9 to August 12. There will be two semesters of fifteen days each. Work may be pursued in either semester.

This School is interdenominational, thorough, and evangelical. Its President is Dr. Wm. E. Biederwolf, and its Dean, Dr. J. A. Huffman. Work is offered leading to the regular theological degrees.

The Faculty announced for 1936 is composed of the following instructors, well known in the theological world: Dr. Samuel M. Zwemer, Dr. Leslie Ray Marston, Prof. Geo. H. Bost, Dr. Howard T. Kuist, Prof. Mabel McQueen Weir, Dr. J. A. Huffman, Dean.

The courses which will be offered are as follows: New Testament, Old Testament, The Holy Spirit, Psychology and Religion, the Origin of Religion, Beginners' New Testament Greek, and Critical Sermon Delivery.

This School affords a splendid opportunity for ministers, teachers, Sunday School Workers, and Laymen to study with teachers who are recognized as authority in their respective fields, during the summer weeks. School and living costs are reasonable at Winona Lake. It is one of America's beauty spots, a fine watering place, dedicated to the higher things of life.

As last year, arrangements have been made whereby a small unit of credit will be allowed for certain lectures attended during the Bible Conference which follows for two weeks at the close of the School. This work is in charge of the

Dean, and is open to those who have enrolled previously in the School of Theology, or who may wish to enroll for this particular work.

A Prospectus may be had by addressing the Dean, Dr. J. A. Huffman, Marion, Ind.

Dr. Rood Becomes the New President at Biola

DR. PAUL W. ROOD enters upon large responsibilities and opportunities this month as the new President of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles, and brings to the work an exceptional equipment and experience as evangelist, Bible teacher, pastor, conference leader, and President of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association. He is well known throughout the United States, his evangelistic and conference ministry having taken him into many sections of this country. He has shown large executive ability, together with the warm personal touch and genuine passion for souls; as pastor and Bible teacher he has opened to multitudes the riches of God's Word. He is a member of the Swedish Mission denomination, having served as pastor of churches in Minneapolis, Seattle, Turlock (Cal.), and Chicago, and has built up large congregations. . . .

The degree of Doctor of Divinity was conferred by Wheaton College in 1932 in recognition of Dr. Rood's outstanding labors in the cause of evangelical Christianity. The Los Angeles Bible Institute is a Gibraltar and light-house of the faith on the Pacific Coast, having graduated more than 2,000 students from its day school and being one of the greatest recruiting grounds for the home and foreign mission fields. It has been brought through difficult problems in recent years, and looks to God's people to unite in prayer for great blessing upon its work under its new President, who accepted this call to service with the words: "May we keep very humble and very close to the heart of God, and He will see us through."—*Sunday School Times*.

The Moody Bible Institute

The years 1936 and 1937 have a special meaning for the Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, as marking the Institute's Jubilee and the Centenary of D. L. Moody's birth. The Jubilee, commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Institute, will be launched with the Founder's Week Conference, February 3 to 7, 1936, and anticipated by a special "Moody Day" on Sunday, February 2, observed by evangelical churches in all parts of the nation. A Campaign of Friendship will continue through all of 1936, and One-Day Bible Conferences will be a feature. Friends and not funds will be the moving objective of this year. At the opening of the fall term at the Institute in 1936, a great home-coming and Christian inspiration week will be promoted, visitors including notable missionaries and Bible teachers from far and near.

D. L. Moody was born at Northfield, Mass., February 5, 1837. The year 1937 will be given to a celebration of that notable event, beginning with the Founder's Week Conference in February. Through the year Bible Conferences and other gatherings will be held in churches and schools in metropolitan centers and elsewhere, stressing the great values for which Moody stood—evangelism and Bible study.

The promotion of the two-year celebration is in charge of a Centenary Committee at the Institute, 153 Institute Place, Chicago, Ill., from which timely information may be had on request.

Evolution known by its Fruit

The Reds are all evolutionists. Evolution has given them their program and method. They got this practical evolution from Carl Marx. He learned it from Hegel, who took it from Spinoza, who got it from the pagan Græeks, who borrowed it from the spirit-medium priestcraft of Egypt and Babylon, who taught the transmigration of souls and the transmutation of species.—*Dr. Gregg*.

THE SANCTUARY

Pais and Mikrob

A Suggestive Study

REVEREND C. J. HOYT

Matthew 5, 6 and 7 Before Calvary and Matthew 18 After.

MATTHEW sixteen is the climax chapter of that book; therein a very distinct view of coming Calvary is seen. "From that time forth began Jesus to show unto His disciples that He must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders, chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day."

The truth in this book is progressively arranged. The position before the sixteenth chapter is from the viewpoint of righteousness; after, from the viewpoint of sin. The ultimate expression of the message up to the middle of the sixteenth verse is, "Do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you"; after the sixteenth, the ultimate message, in view of sin and Calvary, is sacrifice and service for others.

John's opening message is, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Thus also Christ opens His message: From that time (*i. e.*, when He was "in the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles") Jesus began to preach and to say, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

The more complete message is found in the Sermon on the Mount. Herein is the constitution of "the Kingdom of Heaven." By His miracles in chapters eight and nine He shows He can make such characters as therein depicted. In the tenth the twelve are chosen. How are the people receiving the social and religious program of the proffered kingdom? The eleventh shows us that only "babes" in spirit are accepting it. In the twelfth He is considered as working under authority of Beelzebub.

Now there is no moral hope for the acceptance of His constitution—the Cross looms in view; He begins to prepare for the future and its activities after Calvary. Man will not receive the "rule of the heavens"; but *He will save* man—there is the "way of the Cross."

So in the thirteenth chapter He gives His seven parables which open with "a sower went forth to sow," thus showing what will be the course of this age after the rejection of the Kingdom of Heaven. In this opening parable we learn that the world will not heed universally.

Omitting further details of the orderly presentation of the truth, we come to the eighteenth chapter to see what is now the demand of Christ since the Kingdom of Heaven (which is His new social order, with Him as administrator) has been rejected.

All the remaining truth of Matthew is presented from the viewpoint of sin, with prophetic views of the necessity of judgment, in view of the fact of man's rejection of Christ as Saviour.

Christ takes a "little child and sets him in the midst." There is rather strong evidence that this child was Peter's—they are in the house at Capernaum. Here Christ gives a message of conversion: "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." Until we come to verse sixth the word used for "little children" is *pais*. Then He adds: "Whosoever shall receive one such little child (Greek, *paidion*) in My Name receiveth Me." The "little child" is safe!

Now He applies the illustrated truth. He starts with the adversative, *but*. "But whosoever shall offend one of these little ones who believeth in me," etc. Here *mikros* is not the same word as *pais*, but an adjective which in itself

means "little." It is used of Zacchæus when he is described as "little in stature." Besides, adults who believe in Christ could not rightly be designated as infants or little children as above. So also in verse ten we read: "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones." Here we have *mikron* again.

Certainly here is a distinct reference to new believers. Christ gives warning that such "little ones" are not to be despised. Is it not a warning that should be heeded? Did not Peter himself lift his hand against the purpose of Christ when he said that He must not go up to Jerusalem and die? Is not this a most necessary warning today to the world which frowns upon the new birth as not essential?

This is the message for this age. This is the message to the unbelieving, socially wretched world today, not the Sermon on the Mount. Men need this message from the viewpoint of *sin*. The Sermon on the Mount shows our sad failure. This message shows us the way out of sin into the righteousness of the great message of the Sermon on the Mount. Matthew 18 is the gateway to Matthew 5, 6 and 7.

What are the ethics of this *way*? They are added by Matthew. Suffice it to say that just below we have the famous verse (Christ is speaking to believers): "Verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." He is here speaking of the ethics of the kingdom. In whose hands are these ethics? In the hands of the unbelieving world? No! by no means. The ethics of the "mystery form" of the kingdom are in the hands of those who have been converted, the "little ones of the kingdom." Moral authority is not in the hand of the world. Not in the hand of any elected ecclesiastic, but in the universal hand of the believer, those who believe in me. The details of the ethical system are in the eighteenth and beyond.

Cranford, New Jersey.

The Request

JOSEPHINE RAND

"My son, give me thine heart."—Prov. 23:26.

"My son, give me thine heart." Yea, Lord, I give Thee mine:

'Tis all I have to give: the power to give is Thine.
For all I have to give, is gift, by grace, from Thee:
Thou askest for my heart; my heart I give to Thee.

Not works Thou seekest, Lord: in vain my works would be
To cause one fleeting thrill of gratitude in Thee.
Thou askest love, dear Lord; Thou givest love to me:
Thou askest for my heart; my heart I give to Thee.

O wealth of love Divine, that passest human ken!—
How measureless the depth—the height—the breadth
again!

The "everlasting love" which Thou dost bear for them
On whom Thy seal is set, as on a priceless gem!

What shall I render, Lord, for all Thy gifts to me?
I simply "take the cup" salvation brings from Thee.
I call upon Thy name, I hear Thy call to me:
Thou askest for my heart; my heart I give to Thee.

The Master Mind

LAWRENCE KEISTER, D.D.

Appoint my task, O Holy Spirit,
Not once but day by day,
And thus ennoble and endear it
While I am growing gray.

Give me Thy light, Thy friendly leading,
Thy glory in my soul,
As ever more my heart is pleading
Since Thou hast made it whole.

Thy Presence breathes a ceaseless blessing
From Christ who reigns above;
In gentle tones His mind expressing,
His wisdom and His love.

Ah well I know and now remember
Thy ever present Guide
Who with an ardor like an ember
That never once has died,

Gave counsel as my life's designer
Including all its course
And set each day as life's refiner
From surface down to source.

Then let Thy light continue shining
Till all my work is done
And evening clouds with silver lining
Adorn the setting sun.

They who seek the throne of grace,
Find that throne in every place;
If we live a life of prayer,
God is present everywhere.

—Oliver Holden

Current Religious Thought

Words and Their Content

PROFESSOR HERBERT W. MAGOUN, PH.D.

A COMPOSITE photograph has a sharp inner section and a nebulous outer edge. Words are like that, and the saying is justified that no two men ever mean exactly the same thing by the same form of words. For that reason there is unending conflict in the intercourse of men, and needless and harmful misunderstandings. Not having defined their terms, men dispute to no purpose and reach no certain conclusion.

Some years ago this was admirably illustrated by a discussion in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* between a Protestant minister and a Catholic priest. Each felt that he had demolished the position of the other; but a careful study of the articles revealed the fact that no common ground had been reached in the entire course of the debate, so that neither had done any real harm to his opponent. The point of view being entirely different, the deductions were necessarily beside the mark all the way through.

Now, this peculiarity has a specific application to discussions about the Bible; for men put into Biblical terms meanings that are not justified by historical facts, and they leave out vital elements that are peculiarly pertinent. To begin with, and this is of the utmost importance, it is evident that the men who wrote the Bible had to use the idioms of their own day. If they had not been allowed to do so, and God had made them put things in a strictly scientific way, no one would have understood what was meant for many long ages, and revelation would have been a complete failure. Scientific criticism because modern scientific statements are not in strict ac-

cord with Biblical ones are therefore not only unfair and unjustifiable but are un-scholarly quibbling born of prejudice.

Verbal inspiration has undoubtedly been overworked in this connection; for it has been held that if God inspired the Bible, He inspired men to write things that were scientifically false. No such statement is true, and no such statement is fair. It implies that the men who make it regard their own interpretation of things as final and infallible, although nothing is more clear than the fact that scientific explanations shift their ground so fast that scientific books that are ten years old are already out of date and untrustworthy. On the other hand, statement after statement in the Bible that has been discredited has turned out to be true and accurate when all the facts were known. The account of Sodom and Gomorrah is now supported by geologic evidence still in existence on the ground.

Verbal inspiration, normally interpreted, must mean that God watched over each writer and saw to it that he formulated his statements to accord with the facts in the case, although he put his words into the idioms of his own day so that all could understand what was meant. Human limitations had to be observed with care or no true revelation would be possible. You cannot teach a child calculus, but must be content to use arithmetic.

The wide divergence of method used and the peculiarities of each writer go to prove that each was allowed the utmost freedom compatible with accuracy; but, on the other hand, the general agreement of all the testimony becomes possible only on the supposition that the

same guiding hand was in control from start to finish. The final content of the words is the same in the last analysis, although their form differs widely. Moreover, if a man could not be trusted to formulate his thoughts himself under the guidance of the Spirit, he was not fit for his task. He would need help only on matters that were not perfectly clear or were beyond his ken, and in such cases the facts as they stand indicate plainly that he got it. Nevertheless, he used words as he was accustomed to do daily.

Thus, when the Psalmist says, "Thy word have I hid in my heart," he is merely saying that he has committed the Pentateuch to memory, or, as we now say, knows it by heart. Neither statement is scientifically correct; but men understand both correctly. When a Chinese mandarin excused himself for not reading any modern literature by saying that he had already stowed away in his stomach all the literature that was worth while, he merely indicated that he knew the Chinese classics *verbatim*. His meaning, not his idiom, was and is the important thing.

No one, so far as now appears, has ever given this aspect of the subject its proper due. Revelation was intended primarily for the men of the age in which it was given. It follows inevitably that it had to be given in forms of speech with which those men were familiar. Otherwise, they could not have understood the message. Formulated in the language of modern science, especially if in a final shape, it would have been incomprehensible for ages, possibly even to men of our day, and therefore an utter failure. As it was, it never was anything like a failure. Men have always understood the message, and it has suited men of all races and climes and been translatable into languages of every sort and kind. Some books are not translatable, but the Bible always is even where it is necessary to substitute some other animal because sheep are unknown.

It deals with the deepest and most incomprehensible of subjects; and yet men can apprehend something of its meaning even there. They are not justified in assuming that terms used in the first chapter of Genesis are to be explained in the same sense in which they are used in some ordinary statement; for the content is different of necessity, and the fact must be faced. Moses was guided in his use of words so that he employed terms of such a sort that they could convey a new and needed meaning while not in any way confusing those who were to hear them.

The sense might be new, and it might not be; for *yôm* must have meant a time period between two terminals, as indicated by E. Doumergue on the authority of M. Ed. Naville, the great Egyptologist. It is the meaning that my own studies led to, and they caused a Hebrew friend who could almost talk Hebrew to exclaim: "I am amazed that you, a Gentile, could sense the meaning of that word so accurately." It commonly meant the daylight period but never included the night, and for that reason the night is put in if an entire day is meant. The Greek had similar limitations, but it combined the words for night and day into one to mean twenty-four hours, getting *nuchthēmeron* as a result.

In the prophets the word is constantly used of a period of indefinite length, and in Zechariah 14:7 we find, "it shall be one day which is known unto Jehovah; not day, and not night." Again, in Job 15:23 we find "He knoweth that the day of darkness is ready at his hand." The time of evil-doing, darkness, the night, must be meant, and *yôm* cannot mean twenty-four hours and still be employed in this way to mean the night. It simply has to be a general term for an indefinite period of time, and it is the only word in Hebrew that can mean an age or epoch. What it now means in Yiddish is of no moment whatever; for an adopted word is always modified in its passage from one language to another, and its basic meaning is forgotten.

What it meant to its original users is the only thing that is germane, and the same thing holds good of phrases. In the New Testament we read that Herod was "eaten of worms," having been smitten suddenly, and the only sensible way to take that phrase is to find out what it meant in that day, if possible. To all appearance, what they meant coincides with what we mean by the technical term acute appendicitis, and in that sense we should take the words, not assume that they refer to actual worms. They judged by appearances as men have always done and then framed words to tell what they supposed was true. There is no warrant whatever for supposing that God inspired Luke to use those three words. He simply allowed him to employ the common term for the disease involved. Nothing else would have been intelligible to his readers.

Similarly, God's messenger that visited the army of Sennacherib and destroyed it in a night, to all appearance, was merely the germs of the bubonic plague or the Black Death. Enough is now known of the history of that campaign to make it certain beyond reasonable doubt that the army had been in contact with rats bearing those germs with them, and wherever that happens there is an outbreak of the plague. Moreover, it is especially virulent when attacking robust men. God used them to save Israel and furnished the prophet with words to foretell the event, or revealed it to him in some other way.

Men are by nature partisan. They gravitate naturally to one side or the other of a question and cling to it tenaciously. Moreover, any one who fails to act in the same way is condemned as a "middle of the roader" or as being "on the fence." The truth, however, is never at either extreme but always somewhere in between. If a person fails to take sides on account of fear for himself or his interests, he is blameworthy; but if he hesitates because he is seeking to know what the truth is and has not yet been able to decide satisfactorily, he deserves praise, not censure. Men of a

judicial mind always do that sort of thing. They do not jump at conclusions and they try to see how much of truth there is on both sides, since a half-truth seems to be much more potent with the run of mankind than a whole one. The whole one takes too much effort to grasp it.

An outstanding illustration may be found in the question, "What think ye of Christ?" Some exalt His divinity until His humanity disappears almost completely, while others exalt His humanity until nothing is left of His divinity as revealed in the New Testament. These latter persons try to explain Him as a product of His times and environment. They would have us believe that they have the "historical Christ," although they refuse to accept a large part of the history as it has come down to us. Like Robert Eisler, they seem to think that friendly testimony must be prejudiced and wrong, while hostile testimony is fair and correct!

Both positions are wrong; for He was a God-man, truly a Son of Man and just as truly a Son of God. We cannot understand it; but, then, we cannot understand a good many things, for instance, why our food grows hair in one place and skin in another. Nature makes no mistakes unless perverted in some way, but her methods are beyond our ken. How we see is something impossible to explain except as to the method used; for the alteration of a tiny photograph upside down and wrong side to into the picture that we see in space passes human comprehension. The hearing is just as mysterious, air vibrations turned into what we call sound. It behooves us to be modest in our decisions as to what is possible and what is not.

A similar difficulty is found concerning the Bible. Some would have it "just like any other book"; but others would make it into a fetich with almost magic powers. It has all the earmarks of divine wisdom, but it also has the earmarks of human limitations in the matter of language. It is, in short, a divine-human book. It has the limitations of the age

which it was written, so far as linguistic forms are concerned, but it also is a marvelous correctness when it is accurately interpreted, and it is an infallible guide to faith and practice.

Ideas of inspiration are often nebulous, and they are sometimes overdone. God used helpers, not animated typewriters, and He was abundantly able to hide those helpers without telling them every word that they were to write. Paul knew how to ask Timothy to bring his parchments and cloak without being told what to say, and in most of the Scriptures the authors could be safely trusted to formulate the truths that had been impressed upon them by God's dealings with them. They understood first. Then they wrote as the prompting of the spirit indicated.

We all see things before we put them definitely into words, and we find it hard at times to express an idea in linguistic form, although we know that we have the thing in mind. Animals do a sort of thinking, but not in words. Any one who has had and studied a pet dog will understand what is meant. Our Boston Terrier, Pete, the day after we arrived at our country abiding place, rushed around the field at full speed. Then he lay down with his head on one side and seemed to be in a brown study. Suddenly his head came up and he dashed off in a new direction. He came back triumphant with a bone that he had hid about ten months before. I saw it all.

Small children understand some things before they do words; for they respond to a warning call almost as quickly as animals do in nature. We do more thinking than we realize without putting the thing into words. In a single look Christ's eyes said to Peter what words would not have said, and, going out, Peter wept bitterly. Some persons can convey a whole message in a handshake. Indians communicate by the sign language without a word, and deaf mute preachers deliver sermons in the same way. It is done largely by gestures. In that way I made a Japanese understand instantly, although I could not have done

so by words. Another laughed at my suggestive pantomime, and he repeated it the next time he saw me. Both laughed.

Ask a mathematician the question: "If six dozen eggs cost as many cents as you can buy eggs for eight cents, how much are eggs a dozen?" and he will see a relationship in the numbers that he does not put into words. An extreme and mean ratio will cause him to write x square equals 8 times 72, and he will soon say that they cost four cents a dozen. The reasoning is mostly without words, but it is correct.

All the Bible writers had some sort of intense experience before they wrote and some had a long period of training. Moses acquired all the learning of the Egyptians, but he had to take a post-graduate course of forty years in the wilderness before he was ready to prepare the Pentateuch. It was all needed for what he was to do for the rest of his life, and God made no mistake in training him for the task. He knew laws and he knew the desert, and God furnished him with distinct messages as needed.

If modern writers were not often at a loss for the right word to express their meaning, such books as Roget's Thesaurus would have no place on bookshelves, and the very existence of such books proves that men get ideas apart from words and then try to find words to express them. When that word, in some individual case, is found, it is a source of satisfaction as well as relief. Inspiration antedated word books by many centuries, and it furnished the right word wherever there was the slightest need, so that the story or message was trustworthy throughout. Archæology is confirming that conclusion in an amazing fashion and silencing the critics.

At times the person writing must have penned things far more wisely than he knew; but in such cases the verbal inspiration must have been so detailed that no error crept in to mar the completed task. No curtailment of freedom was involved; for each wrote in humble

dependence on God for help in his effort, and it was given fully. Otherwise, there could be no such inerrancy as we find in the content of the words even where their form registers some crudity of the age in which the words were written. They will always be basically true when taken in the sense intended. Perversion is possible; for even laws cannot be so framed that perversion is impossible, and the story is told of a law involved before a judge who had helped to frame it. He thought it could not be misinterpreted; and yet a clever lawyer made him doubt for a time what the law really did mean.

For many centuries the riddle of Classical prosody defied solution. It was generally agreed that it had no solution, because native testimony was a hopeless mass of contradictions. The content of words was the key to it, and it is fully solved in every detail. Thirty years were spent in the research; for every position taken by modern scholars was wrong, and the entire matter had to be re-examined at every point with excursions far afield to find the correct point of view.

Fundamentals had been overlooked. Meter and rhythm had been confused. Two years were taken to study that item alone. They were found to be not only distinct entities but conflicting entities, and the contradictory statements were all true! Anything said of meter could not be true of rhythm and vice versa. Moreover, the native authorities, when finally read, were found to have made the same distinction in the same way. The only conflict was in the subjects. They had been confused.

Idioms differ. Some English ones are linguistic monstrosities; but we keep right on using them, and no one is the wiser save a few linguists. Their content is well defined, and that suffices. An Arab will say, "We have arrived," as soon as he can see his destination. We refuse to look at the matter in that way, but it is his way of speaking. Hebrew words were less exact than ours, and a man's "son" might be his great-great-

grandson or yet more removed. Jesus was a Son of David; but that meant about the same that we would mean by calling Him a Davidson. In either case a patronymic is really the thing involved, even if scholars have not recognized the fact. In a Levirate marriage it must be recognized; for the real father does not count, and the dead brother gives his name to the son.

The puzzle in 1 Chronicles 3:17 may be explained on that basis; for a Levirate marriage occurred somewhere in the line, and it may have been at that point. Jeconiah and his father were both under a curse to have no male issue to sit on the throne (Jer.22:30 and 36:30). Assir was therefore probably the son-in-law of Jeconiah and in line of Solomon but without male issue. If his half-brother Neri married his widow and begot Shealtiel, the line was Nathan's and the curse was operative. But Shealtiel had no male issue, and he had to adopt the son of a younger brother, Pedaiab (1 Chron.3:18), whose name was Zerubbabel.

When Matthew says that Shealtiel begat Zerubbabel, he uses the word in a peculiar legal way, not in its ordinary sense. In a similar way, Matthew says that Joram begat Uzziah; for the actual line (1 Chron.3:11-12), was Joram, Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah (Uzziah). The word was used with its legal content, and the statement is not false for that reason. Much quibbling has been possible in such matters; but common sense is still a good, reliable thing to have and to use. What the words meant to the men of the times is the only safe guide, not what they mean to a modern critic.

Outward appearance still counts too heavily with devout Christians as well as with critics, and both need to be more careful in forming hasty judgments; for one may be as much at fault as the other, and the critic may actually have a better case linguistically than the Christian. That is not to be taken as meaning that he is right; for a man is never right when he has but a half-truth.

to rest on, and that is the usual situation. The translation itself may be at fault as it is in Luke 3:23, where the correct meaning is, "being, as the custom was, a Son of Joseph."

The verb is a denominative from the word meaning "law, custom," and it cannot mean "suppose," although it may mean to believe. The custom or law was the habit of naming sons with the name of the father added, as in Exodus and elsewhere. Joshua Ben-Nun and Caleb Ben-Jephunneh, like Zerubbabel Ben-Shealtiel, are proper names, not records of descent. Peter was Simon Bar-Jonah, and Jesus was Jesus Bar-Joseph, which is what Luke really intended to say. The translators inserted a definite article (no such article is used in Bible names) and then missed the point entirely.

In Genesis 45:8 Joseph is made to say that God has made him a father to Pharaoh; but the chances are that the word is Egyptian, not Hebrew, and means "overseer." Joseph had become Grand vizir, or Prime minister, to Pharaoh; but the Egyptian word happened to be like the Hebrew word for father, and it was so translated, although it is well known that Egyptian terms are common in the account of the sojourn in Egypt.

No connection now appears in John 1:13-14; but the original text was in the singular, as three of the church fathers testify. They take the statement back almost two hundred years beyond the oldest manuscripts, and famous Bible critics admit that they must be right. The very form of the statement itself proves that they are right. The Greek never places ten words between a relative and its antecedent; but, as it now stands, there are ten words so placed. The verb means "begat," the word for blood is in the plural, and "husband," not man is the true meaning of the Greek term.

Direct and positive testimony to the virgin birth is involved; for the correct text meant, "those who believe on the name of Him, who was begotten, not of bloods (sexual union), nor of the will of the flesh (carnal desire), nor of the will

of a husband, but of God. And the Word was *thus* made flesh and dwelt among us." The Vulgate uses the word in Latin that means a husband, a male as distinguished from a female, and it is the same with the Greek word. It cannot mean a human being, "man."

This whole subject is exceedingly important and very broad. In the story of the ten plagues, it has been discovered that "first born" was a form of speech indicating the best and strongest rather than the oldest. As they were the ones most likely to suffer, the idiom was perfectly proper and correctly used. They so understood it, and we have no business to be critical or unduly positive as to the thing meant. The differences in the idioms employed and the changes in language furnish a certain amount of support for saying that the Bible contains "outworn categories"; but it is not a justification for the conclusions based thereon.

Translators always have had limitations. Our word biology contains the Greek word *bios*; but that word never meant "life." It always meant a particular kind of life, a way of living. It is the kind of life that people live, plus the deceitfulness of riches, that chokes the word. Timothy was advised that a warrior does not take his own method of living with him when he goes to camp, and other passages are similar. In eight other places the word used by Luke is translated "suppose"; but it means believe. The laborers did not suppose they would get more: they believed that they would. The mob believed that Paul was dead. The jailer believed that the prisoners had escaped, and so with the other passages. Semites do not suppose things. They are intense and act accordingly.

Pidgin English is instructive. "Belong" serves many purposes in it, and what the user means must be surmised from the possibilities. On a steamer of the Dollar line, another illustration was encountered. A complaint was brought to the purser by one of the "boys." "What is his name?" "Dunno." "What

is the number of his cabin?" "Dunno." "Well, I can't do anything till I know who he is." "You savvy" (do know). "Top side savvy box no got grass." The purser located him at once. He had no hair, on top.

If some one were to infer that the Chinese sometimes have grass growing on their heads, it would be no more ridiculous than some things that have been inferred, as I know from experience. That nonsense is the result does not prevent the error. Locust (a tree) was taken by a Frenchman to mean a grasshopper, and he translated a text with the statement that America had huge grasshoppers and a man hitched his horse to one.

With the beginning of Genesis it is interesting to compare the introductory words of the Law Book of Manu. Both deal with chaos, nebulousity.

There was this universe, enveloped-in-darkness, undistinguished, without-characteristic-mark, unimaginable, unknowable, sunk-in-sleep, as it were altogether.

The parallel is near enough to suggest that the Hindus once had the same revelation but lost it in human speculations, and one or two Rig-Veda hymns carry the same suggestion. Moreover, the dual form for "waters" and "heavens" in Genesis may have an explanation in the Vedic literature. It recognizes two heavens, the sky (cloud region) and the blue vault beyond, and it also recognizes two waters, those on the earth and those in the sky. "Firmament" is a sorry translation for the Hebrew word, which means expanse really, and we now know that nothing solid is required to hold up the water that descends as rain.

Where mountains and rain are associated in the Vedas, nothing more than clouds can be looked for, since they saw mountains in the clouds and named them accordingly. The crest of a thunderstorm was a dragon holding back the rain, and the lightning was a weapon with which he was slain. He reappeared, however, in every storm, and they did not stop to consider any inconsistency. Their poetic diction merely covered the

familiar phenomena of a thunderstorm, to which they assigned animal life and activity. In a single hymn, *Soma* might mean a bush, the fermented juice of that bush, or the god which was supposed to intoxicate those who drank the liquid. We consider such things as inconsistencies. They did not trouble them.

There may be more behind a word than appears on the surface. Thus, the Greek word commonly translated "sin" really means etymologically "missing the mark." It implies that the sinner is a failure. He cannot shoot straight or throw a javelin accurately. He does not merely fail to hit the bull's eye; he misses the target altogether, a disgraceful performance for any one to be guilty of. Some minds could be reached by that idea as they could not be reached by the idea of trespassing. That might seem to be a small matter; but being a complete failure—!

The corresponding verb means "to miss, to fail, to lose out" on something, and men do not fancy that sort of thing. The modern idea of sin approaches the matter from a different angle; but sin is big enough and bad enough to accommodate all the angles involved. Even if the modern idea involves a deliberate wrong doing or a deliberate shunning of duty, the sinner is still a failure, and he still misses the mark. The figure is just as suggestive as ever and just as significant.

Oriental languages abound in figurative forms of speech, and Hebrew is no exception. For that reason, men can misinterpret it and misconstrue it to fit their own notions. The Jews thought they knew how Messiah was to come and what He was to do. They did not. They could not understand the saying, "the kingdom of God is within you," and world dominion was the thing they craved. They rejected Jesus, until He rode into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday. They saw in that a revolt from Rome and went wild. He did not follow it up, and they turned against Him in fury and shouted, "Crucify him, crucify him!" Then they spread the story that

He was illegitimate and thus put Him beyond the pale. That is why they cannot accept Him to this day. He is an outcast to them.

Preconceived ideas have no place in the interpretation of words. Men forget that and twist words out of their true meaning. Their whole attitude is

wrong when they do that. It is better to confess one's ignorance as Thomas Huxley did than to undertake to explain things on a basis that fits our own ideas of things as they should be. We really know very little and reach false conclusions easily. It may be well to realize it.

Belmont, Massachusetts.

J' Accuse Les Critiques

(Criticise the Critics)

CANON DYSON HAGUE, D.D., WYCLIFFE COLLEGE, TORONTO

When we printed Canon Dyson Hague's article on "The Wonder of the Book" in our last issue we expressed the hope that an article he worked on earlier in the year and meant to send to us at the Easter season could be located. We are under obligations to Mrs. Hague for locating and sending us this article, and to Dr. R. B. McElheran, Principal of Wycliffe College, at Toronto, who edited it. This message from Canon Hague surely cannot be misunderstood!

I MEAN the rationalistic critics. I am heart and soul for all criticism of sanctified, humble and Spirit-led scholars. I thank God for all the revelations that have been made of Biblical truth and interpretation by the investigations of Bengel, Edersheim, Orr, Saphir, Wilson, Green, Bettex, Kyle, Gibson, Price, Fausett, Finn, Lightfoot, Westcott, Alford, Ryle, Pierson and a hundred others whose critical conclusions are not based upon the pre-established theories of rationalism or the undiluted assumptions of German atheists, but the illumined results of Spirit-taught and Christ-guided scholarship. As for the rationalistic critics, as a whole, with all my heart and soul I am against them because I side with Christ and I side with Paul.

I am against them because they are so often blind leaders of the blind. They seem to be ignorant of the real, deep, true, elemental meanings of the Scriptures that they profess to criticize. They lack the first element of high scriptural criticism, the faculty of reverence; the instinct of awe, and the desire to pene-

trate into the mysteries of the supernatural (Isa.66). They are incompetent to grasp or judge the things that they attempt to investigate. A spirit of deep sleep has been poured out upon them and has closed their eyes so that the vision has become as the words of a book that is sealed, which men deliver to one who is a scholar with the request: Read this, I pray thee. And the scholarly one answers: I cannot, for it is sealed. No man in heaven, in earth or under the earth can by human scholarship open This Book.

Only the Lion of Judah's Tribe, the Root of David, has by His victory prevailed to open the Book, and only he who has the spirit of the Lamb that was slain can understand (Rev.5:5). To criticize as scholars they must be familiar with the rudiments of the beginning of the divine revelation, which I take to be the acceptance of the words and letters that they investigate as being the oracles of God, not the excogitations or transmissions of fallible men.

The more I read their writings the more I am convinced in my soul that they are blind leaders of the blind, unable to grasp and judge and criticize the simplicities of the Word, much less its profundities. They are without true knowledge, the epignosis of the truth (Eph.1), the experience of its reality. They are on the wrong track altogether. With the wrong key they are trying to open the wrong door.

My instinct, my heart cries out against them, for out of this precious temple they would take away my Lord and His words as divine and inspired. They would denude and evacuate the holy temple of Christ Who is its author and chief end. They devaluate and evaluate it of all life and light and glory. They are as post mortem surgeons who work remorselessly upon a dead body, dividing it, cutting it up. For this Living Word of the Living God is to them as a corpse, out of which the life blood has gone and the life breath (inspiration) departed.

I am against them because they are disobedient and disloyal to God's Word, God's Law. For this Book, in its entirety is not only the testimony of the Lord and the word of the Lord and the statutes of the Lord, but it is also the law of the Lord and the commandments of the Lord. Of it as a whole it is Divinely said: "God spake these words and said;" "The mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." His commandments are to be received and obeyed. They were not given to be questioned and criticized.

I am against them because they fail to apprehend its divine unity, its unity of authorship, construction and interpretation, which none of the rationalists can understand because no man knoweth the things of God by the spirit of the world; the teaching of the Holy Ghost is by comparison of spiritual things with spiritual. In this Book and throughout it from beginning to end, there are transcendent words and phrases and reasonings and teachings demanding a higher than the highest intellect, a penetrative insight never to be learned in the pages or at the feet of rationalistic teachers. There is a diacrisis, a dianoia (Eph.1:17,18) which the Holy Spirit alone imparts according to the divinely inspired teaching of 1 Cor.2:11-16. The consensus of a myriad minds, the consensus of a catholic unity of Evangelical agreement confirms this.

The history of Christendom proves that a thousand and one Spirit-taught

expositors agree in the main in the prophecies, meanings and truths of the Bible as the Word of God. This is in itself a marvel. It is the unity of faith. It is the discernment of love. It is the insight of a spiritual revelation. It is the higher knowledge of the heart. As Pascal, the greatest of French Christian scholars, said, the heart has reasons that reason does not know.

The Book confirms itself. Higher than all confirmations of scholarship, above all geographical, geological, archæological, historical confirmations, above all the corroborations of apologetic scholarship, the Book confirms itself. It is self-apologetic. It is self-establishing. It is self-evidencing. The Christ-taught soul stands before it and cries:

Concerning Thy testimonies, I have known of old that Thou hast founded them for ever (Psalm 119:152); Thy word is true from the beginning: and every one of Thy righteous judgments endureth for ever (Psalm 119:160).

Every true Christian knows that. As it is read prayerfully, meditatively, reverently in the quiet depth of the Christ-taught soul it verifies itself. No historical critic or professor is needed to prove to the believer that the Bible is God's own Word indeed. The Holy Ghost Himself is the Author and Giver of that conviction. Its self-authenticatingness is like that of water, sunlight, air, life or love.

I am against them for, as I study men like Wellhausen, Kuenen and, alas, even many of the writers in Peake's Commentary, my heart within me tells me that they speak and write not as sons who find joy and peace in believing and are clothed with humility, but as the proud who presume to set themselves above the level of the very Apostles themselves, and presume to divide and deride the very words of Christ Himself, not as sons led by the Spirit, but as enemies who break into the camp, naye the very citadel itself, casting that which is holy unto the dogs that are without and the pearls, the precious pearls of God's truth, to the swine who

trample them underfoot, who turn again to rend.

God's children discover beauty; critics find only blemishes. God's children revel in the glories; they spend time and strength and marvelous acumen of knowledge upon the discovery of their imagined discrepancies, faults and contradictions. The true student of the Word rejoices in one thousand and one evidences to him of the words of Christ: "Thy word is truth" (John 17:17). But with inadequate knowledge and defective insight and lack of sympathy, which has characterized many German critics for the last fifty years, any amount of faults have been found; faults, as Sir William Ramsay says, which are only conjured up by ignorance, the ignorance of the modern scholar.

I am against them because they look at the surface. They analyze the small things. They delve into the region of the letter. They search for mistakes, trivialities, small errors of copyists, and out of a mole hill they make a mountain. They are so narrow, oh so narrow! They are so easily side-tracked, and veer so quickly to a one-sided and false interpretation.

I am more and more impressed with the narrowness of the broad school, with the bitterness of the men who profess to be so liberal. They sneer at the out-of-dateness of what they call the old-fashioned school, while all the time they are simply displaying their own ignorance of the height and depth and length and breadth of the marvelous writings sealed with the seal of divinest truth, inspired power, heavenly glory. They do not know how ignorant they are, how childishly ignorant. When they speak of the moral crudities of the Old Testament they only expose their own moral crudity. When they talk of the Bible as mere folklore, they only reveal the incapability of their mind to discern between the divinely revealed and the absurdly rational.

Who but a man with the mind of a child could accept the idea of Professor

Winckler that Joseph is obviously an astral myth, David a solar hero and that Joshua is the sun? Or, imagine the idea of scholarship being given to the equally childish conception of Wellhausen that Abraham was the myth of the rosy dawn; or, another great German scholar, that Sarah was the wife of the Moon god; and Saul, the new moon. Or, imagine a man with any balance of thought or insight into the Old Testament asserting that Jehovah, our great God and Father, the Lord God Almighty, was a mere tribal god of sporadic Kenites. Or, that this Hebrew god *Yahweh* was taken from Siniatic storm god and formerly associated with the Babylon pantheon.

O, what blind leaders of the blind they are! How they strain at a gnat! How they swallow a camel! How ignorant they are of the profound and deep and eternal! How like the physicians, against whom Amiel declaimed, they are superficially proven, destitute of intuition and sympathy, strangers to divine things! How they revel in dogmatic assumptions, which higher scholarship has entirely disproved (Orr's *Problem of the Old Testament*, 60-86-118-150)!

Their appalling dogmatism with regard to folklore, tribal history, unknown redactors, forgeries, literary inconsistencies are so far fetched to the thoughtful and balanced mind that the teachings of these so-called critical scholars seem to be the mental illusions and conceits of autosuggestion. Their scholarly criticism, says Professor Bettex, literally wades in psychological contradictions and inconsistencies (pp.239-244), and their frivolous and arrogant treatment of the authors and books of Scripture evokes a feeling of weariness that men should devote life and strength to manufacturing so many boldly fantastic or insipidly childish hypotheses and theories.

How they talk of myths and folklore! It is as if blindness, not in part but whole, had fallen upon them. They put the entrancing stories of Jacob and Joseph with their touching appeal and pathos to the hearts of men in the same

class as the legendary tales of Robin-hood or Jack the Giant Killer and, with appalling dogmatism, class many of the most touching and revealing passages in the Old Testament with the myths of ancient Greece or Rome.

A book like Frazer's *Folklore in the Old Testament* makes the very blood boil with indignation. We wonder how a scholar could write such absurdities and contradictions. Splendidly Saphir has shown with the accumulated honors of Oxford, Cambridge, Glasgow and Paris, in his *Divine Unity of Scripture* how Plato shows that, as the Greeks advanced in knowledge, they became ashamed of the fabulous and grotesque myths of their early history (Republic, 11-67) and how in the New Testament our Lord and His Apostles, so far from disclaiming the early stories of the Bible, protruded them as full of divine truth and teaching.

Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were no mythical characters, and the stories of creation and Paradise, of the Patriarchs and Moses, and the history of the Children of Israel were unadorned and beautiful stories instinct with the natural tones of truth. And so Peter, by the Holy Ghost, boldly declares that when they spoke of the power and the advent of Jesus they were not following cleverly devised myths or fabricated legends (2 Pet. 1:16). Oh, how blind they are! They are incapable of seeing that there is a something, an indefinable something, sacred and sublime, indefinable, separate, that puts the Bible as a whole and its words in a class by themselves.

I was impressed with this the other day when reading a simple story called *The Pillar of Light* when, in describing the perils of a shipwrecked crew, the author introduced the words of Isaiah. I could not help thinking how infinitely removed from the context was this insertion and how a majesty, a glory, a dignity was in these words that lifted it to an altitude above the whole of the descriptive beauties of the volume. You entered, as it were, another realm. I

think it was Dr. Chalmers who drew attention to the fact that, in spite of their scholarship and the great gulf that intervened from the viewpoint of learning and intellectual competency between the early fathers and the writers of the Gospels and St. Peter and St. John, there was a really infinite distance between them. The writings of the ablest of the post-Apostolic scholars were unpossessed of that dignity and majesty and inspiration that characterize all Bible writing.

I am against them because their criticism is not honest and fair. It is partial and small. Its whole object seems to be to discover defects, to find small imperfections. They are like the man who would write an account of his visit to Westminster Abbey and spend the greater part of his description with an account of how, after an elaborate investigation, he had discovered an ancient word that was spelled incorrectly on one of the small tombstones in the central or north-east corner, while the glory and the beauty of the magnificent pillars, the splendour of the architraves and matchless windows and glorious roof and the gleam of the chancel are all unseen, or, if seen, unnoted, undescribed or unadmired.

To use Parker's illustration of the telegram and the man who spent his time upon the telegraph operator and the telegraph boy. How did he get the telegram? Was the man old enough to take it? Was he sure it was written and sent? Was he capable of transmitting it correctly, and was the boy capable of bringing it? What kind of paper was it written on, and where was the paper made? Was the printing in blue or black ink, and so on and so on, instead of opening it and reading it—a message full of love from his father, telling him that he was sending his wise counsel and help.

These critics always see things from the wrong angle. Grubbing letters when they should be grasping horizons, they would analyze the glass of God's clear water in the search for a thousand mi-

robes instead of drinking it to their soul's delight. Instead of taking the bread and eating it they would subject it to the scrutiny of a scientific search for its possible unvitaminic elements. O, how blind they are!

I am against them because their pursuit of pre-judged theories has entirely warped their capacity for wise discernment. They are like the men whom the scholar described as "sitting in their study and consulting only their own books, and then attempting disquisitions into the Bible, and telling how they would have made the Bible if God had given them that commission! They would have described chimeras corresponding to the fatuity of their own minds without an understanding truly divine." That, too, was a sagacious remark of Matthew Arnold. He said that "if you were to shut up a number of men to make study and learning the business of their lives, how many of them, from want of some discipline or other, seem to lose all balance of judgment, all common sense!"

I remember years ago my blood boiling as I read in the *Edinburgh Review* or one of the *Quarterlies* a criticism of Tennyson and especially of his *In Memoriam*. It was very able. It was very clever. But all that a man could find in the magnificent *In Memoriam* was what was to his mind an ill-placed and incomprehensible expression, *The bar of Michael Angelo*. All the glory, all the beauty, all the splendour of that almost matchless mind was unperceived and undescribed by the man who only saw some defect of his own critical perception. He looked at the tiny splinter in the great author's eye and failed to see the great beam of timber which was in his own eye and prevented his seeing anything aright.

I remember, too, another thing. Years ago I wrote a book, as the result of years of study, upon *The Church of England Before the Reformation* (Hodder and Stoughton). It was a book of four hundred pages and was described by one

English paper as "A really notable work"; by another, "this standard work"; by another as "a valuable contribution to English Church history by a Canadian clergyman who has laid the whole Anglican Church under great obligations to him." On page 292 I had written these words: "There is no desire here to disparage the obvious historical fact of the mutual action and reaction of religious opinions in this uniquely 'transitorial' age." Now, I did not write "transitorial" age at all. I wrote "transitional." But the printer, by mistake, printed it as "transitorial." And all that the critic in one English paper had to say of that four hundred page work was that it was a pity that a Canadian, Mr. Hague, used that unknown word, transitorial. Fancy! That was all he had to say. Not a single word of the book, its content, its treatment, its one thousand and one historical facts, its summary and conclusions. All that the critic could say was that he had discovered a mistake by a Canadian writer. A mistake that was not a mistake but a printer's error. And, after all, I found that word in a copy of the *Scotsman* that spoke of the difficulties and dangers of a transitorial period in theology.

These critics of the Bible! In their search for supposed misprints, incompatibilities, documentary manipulations, unhistorical paradoxes, obscure theories, pseudographs and pious frauds, they are blind, stone blind to the grandeur of the Bible as a whole and unable to perceive the absurdity of their self-contradicting theories and impossible assumptions. They cannot, they will not see that the Bible is one, and, to alter Tennyson, that throughout it through the ages one increasing purpose runs and the plan of God unfolded with the process of the suns. They cannot see that the Bible is the book of redemption, of God's purpose from the beginning to the final consummation of grace in the new heaven and the new earth and that ten thousand times ten thousand redeemed by the blood of the Lamb.

As Dr. Orr says (*Problem of the Old Testament*, p.61), one looks in vain in Kuenen or Wellhausen or Stade or Gunkel or in such Old Testament history as that of Professor H. P. Smith for any perception of the deeper ideas that lie in the Genesis narratives or of their organic relation to the rest of Scripture. To a developing purpose of salvation they seem altogether blind. In this their criticism is already self-condemned; for what they fail to see is discerned by many others as keenly critical as themselves.

I am against them because they are not original. They are like the sheep that Carlyle describes in his essay on Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, when he speaks of the servile imitancy of a flock of sheep. "Sheep have their Bellwether, whom they follow blindly. As Jean Paul once said, if you hold a stick before the Wether so that he, by necessity, leaps in passing you and then withdraw your stick the flock will nevertheless all leap as he did; and the thousandth shall be found impetuously vaulting over air as the first did over an otherwise impassable barrier.

"Reader," said Carlyle, "ponder well those ovine proceedings. Thou wilt find them all curiously significant." How these critics and nearly the whole of the modern school follow slavishly with curious and childlike confidence at the tail of exploded and disproved theories, theories and hypotheses that have been weighed in the balance of a sounder scholarship and found wanting by such great scholars as Professor Green of Princeton and Orr and Finn and Margolioth and Møller and many great German scholars.

But the marvelous thing is that Christians, Christian scholars, Christian professors, leaders who profess and call themselves Christians, accept with credulous gullibility and retail with monumental infallibility the axioms and theories of a profligate free thinker like Astruc and avowed and unabashed deists, rationalists and infidels like De-

Wett, Graf, Wellhausen and Kuenen! It passes one's understanding. The Bellwethers were all of them rationalists. They, all of them, repudiate in our sense of the words, inspiration and revelation. They, all of them, wrote from the human naturalistic viewpoint. To them there was nothing divine in the Bible. There was no Holy Ghost inspiration. These leaders all believed that the Bible was the result of human excogitation, not divine inspiration, and the Old Testament was largely a fortuitous course of Babylonian myths, legendary accretions, folklore, unreliable tribal history, and the compilation of largely unknown authors, unknown redactors.

The long succession of distinguished scholars by whom the devisive hypothesis has been elaborated in its application to the Pentateuch have been unbelievers in an immediate supernatural revelation. And they have not hesitated to avow their want of faith in the reality of prophecy and miracle (Green, *Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, 165).

And yet these men, on account of their so-called learning, have been given a position of appalling authority, an authority that is incredible. They might have been apostles! They might have been sent from heaven with the voice of God! They might have been the accredited messengers of the Most High! Certainly from the way in which their theories are believed and followed today, you would imagine that these men were on a higher level than St. Paul, St. Peter, St. John, and almost of our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ Himself. *O magna vis erroris!* O the mighty strength of error!

I appeal to the great body of my brother ministers in every branch of the Church of Christ and to my brother professors in the colleges of the British Empire and the United States and ask them if it is possible for anyone to point to a single one of the assured results of the higher criticism that was originated by a writer who believed heart and soul in the authority and inspiration of the

Bible as a whole, in the deity of Jesus Christ, His vicarious atonement, and His second personal advent.

I say originated. For instance, did one of the great assumptions upon which the whole fabric of the higher criticism has been reared, such as the Document Hypothesis of Astruc and Eichhorn, now almost universally accepted with its post-Mosaic anachronisms, inaccuracies and contradictions, spring out of the heart of a really consecrated Christian soul?

Or, take the Fragment Hypothesis, which Professor Green characterized as the Document Hypothesis run mad, *reductio ad absurdum*. Could anyone believe that a believing Christian would slice up the books of the Bible and pretend that he had knowledge enough to know the successive variant editions of each document and who were the *Elohistic* and *Jehovistic* redactors, and who were the authors or at least the compilers of these documents, a congerie of fragments and heterogeneous absurdities? Or, imagine a man before he began to write filling himself with the spirit of the 119th Psalm excogitating the Supplement Hypothesis or the Crystalization Hypothesis or the multiple authorship of Isaiah or the modern critical treatment of the Gospels and the Epistles!

But it will be said: what about Davidson and Robertson Smith and Dr. Briggs and George Adam Smith and Dr. Driver, men of earnest Christian character and apparently real faith in Christ? But I repeat, these men, Christian men, British and American, who are in the van of the leadership of the so-called moderate higher critics and whose leadership and teaching have been accepted by every writer almost in Peake's Commentary and every writer in Gore's Commentary, have not *originated* one of the so-called assured results. The writer in Gore's Commentary on Genesis follows Driver like a child. But Driver follows Wellhausen and Kuenen and accepts most positively the theory of

the J.E.P.D. documents. It is notorious that Dr. Samuel Davidson simply re-tailed the fallacies of the German rationalists and brought into England the Supplementary Hypothesis of Bleek, DeWett and Knobel. No one imagines that Robertson Smith or George Adam Smith or Briggs originated any of their views. The hand is the hand of Briggs or Smith or Davidson or Driver but the voice is the voice of Kuenen or Wellhausen.

In vain does Dr. Driver say that criticism in the hand of Christian scholars does not banish or destroy the inspiration of the Old Testament. It presupposes it. But the originating, preponderating scholarship has not been in the hands of Christian scholars at all. It has sprung from the brain and come from the hands of men who disavow belief in God and do not accept either the authority or the inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures. No one but a child could believe that the Bible to a man to whom Jehovah is a mere tribal deity and the Jews' religion a human evolution and their sacred literature simply folklore and tribal traditions with mythical and pseudonymous admixtures is a Bible that could not in any sense of the word be called the authoritative and divinely inspired Word of God or even that it contains the Word of God. For, as Pusey sarcastically and truly remarked (Daniel 28), their Bible is a revelation of no one knows what, made no one knows how, and lying no one knows where, except that it is to be somewhere between Genesis and Revelation, but probably to the exclusion of both.

I am against them because their attitude is essentially unscientific. They are the slaves of men who were themselves slaves. Their attitude is that of their masters. It is notorious that Wellhausen, in his later years, definitely refused to read anything on the other side. Professor Koenig pointed out that Wellhausen's version of the History of Israel is based, not on the Bible, but on Hegel,

as it was taken wholesale from Vatke who, like a typical German, evolved his History from Hegel's Philosophical Principles.

But what was that to Wellhausen? Did he care a jot for the dozen and one scholars as able as himself who destroyed his assumptions and theories? No! Not in the slightest. Did it matter to Eichhorn or DeWett or Vatke or George or Graf or these men that their fantastic theories were relentlessly torn into pieces by scholars as great as or greater than themselves, that Delitzsch and König demolished Wellhausen, and Green and Orr, Davidson and Smith and Briggs and Driver? Still thousands and tens of thousands believe that the great scholarship of the German school is so assured that its results must be accepted because so commonly accepted by the academic world.

Assured results, indeed! Why, one of the leading scholars of Great Britain, the Dean of Canterbury, at a meeting of the Victoria Institute, said:

It is less than honest for persons in authority, Professors and Deans and even Bishops, to be treating the results of the German criticism of the Pentateuch as presented, for instance, by the late Dr. Driver as having been definitely established. On the contrary, scholars of the highest positions, both at home, on the Continent and in America, are not only maintaining a strenuous opposition to these complicated and artificial theories but are urging on broad historical grounds the substantial truth of the traditional belief.

In vain did Dr. Emil Reich write declaring that the world must surely lack a sense of humor when it allows itself to be lectured upon the origin of religions by some little philological pedants who make up for their ignorance and insufficiency by incantations of high sounding names. In vain did Professor Bettex of Stuttgart say that their scholarly criticism literally wades in psychological contradictions and inconsistencies. Their frivolous and arrogant treatment of the authors and books of Scripture evokes a feeling of weariness that men should devote life and strength to manufacturing so many boldly fantastic

or insipidly childish hypotheses and theories.

In vain did Professor Flinders Petrie say that much of the modern Biblical criticism is crude theorizing, mere guesswork, and wild contradiction. Denial has become in this field, he says, a passion of the mind. And alterations in the text are often made without warrant of probability, and have their root in a desire to exhibit the skill of the critic, rather than the truth of the matter. In vain did Professor Langdon at the Congress of Orientals at Oxford in 1928 say that recent discoveries had revolutionized the study of Biblical criticism. In vain did Dr. Jacobs say that the account of the Flood in Genesis was a literary unity, and he denied the distinction between *Jahweh* and *Elohim* as differentiating documents. In vain did Sir Charles Marston deny that anyone had the right to speak of the early narratives of Genesis as folklore or myth. He says we have the more reliable evidence of pick and spade in the countries where the events spoken of in the Bible purport to have taken place; and he adds:

Let us clear away all this pre-war German scholastic debris enshrined in so many modern English commentaries. Still a myriad of so-called Christian scholars assert that they cannot any longer maintain their old views with regard to the Bible. They still greedily swallow the main theories of the main school of Biblical schools. Still are they obsessed with a fear of the old orthodoxy and, while accusing others of blindly following the old fundamentals, they themselves refuse to consider the other side when put forth by such unquestioned scholars as Green and Orr. Or, what is worse, they dismiss it with a "there-is-no-other-side" pooh, pooh.

I am against them because they are against my Lord. To the Christian Christ's word is final. He is the final court of appeal and there is no appeal from that court. There can be no doubt of Christ's position. Our Lord believed and affirmed the historic veracity of the whole of the Old Testament writings implicitly (Luke 24:44). And the Canon, or collection of books of the Old Testament, was precisely the same in Christ's time as it is today. And further: Christ

Jesus our Lord believed and emphatically affirmed the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch (Matt. 5:17-18; Mark 12:26-36; Luke 16:31; John 5:46-47). As Professor Orr says:

Our Lord did constantly affirm the Mosaicity of the Books of the Law He quoted, based on His divine and human consciousness that God's Word was conveyed to men through them (*Problem of the Old Testament*, p. 524).

True, say the critics. But then neither Christ nor His Apostles were critical scholars. But, as a German scholar said, if they were not *critici doctores*, they were *doctores veritatis* who did not come into the world to fortify popular errors by their authority. They say that Christ's knowledge as a man was limited, that He grew in knowledge, which, of course, implies His ignorance, and, if His ignorance, why not His ignorance with regard to historical criticism.

Now what this practically means is that Jesus did know perfectly well that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, but

allowed His disciples to believe that Moses did, and taught His disciples that Moses did, simply because He did not want to upset their simple faith in the whole of the Old Testament as the actual and authoritative and divinely revealed Word of God. And further: It means that if He did not know the books to be spurious when they were spurious and the fables and myths to be mythical and fabulous; if He accepted legendary tales as trustworthy facts, then He was not and is not omniscient.

I am against them because their whole object seems to be the dismemberment of the Bible, to create incongruities, to create discordances where none exist, to sunder passages from their context and destroy all the divinely inspired harmony of the various books and sections thereof. There is nothing, said Professor Green, that marvelous scholar, over which the critics seem to have such an aversion as a harmonizing interpretation. And then he naively adds, naturally, for it annuls all their work.

Have Defenders of Genesis Met their Waterloo?

JAMES B. TANNEHILL, B.S.

PART II

IN my introductory article, in the last issue, I think I made it clear that the Bible, especially the book of Genesis, is not in agreement with present day teaching in most colleges concerning anthropology, chronology, origin of man and Noah's Flood. I also charged, and I think I was right in so doing, that most of those Bible periodicals that style themselves "evangelical," are keeping absolutely silent as to these false teachings in many present day colleges, especially concerning the antiquity of man and Noah's Flood.

While these faint-hearted periodicals are constantly and rightly upbraiding the Modernists for their refusal to endorse the Bible teaching as to the virgin

birth of Christ, His bodily resurrection, miracles and salvation by the blood of Christ, they themselves ignore entirely those other historical, scientific and chronological questions that are disturbing and driving into infidelity hosts of our finest young people, many of whom come from Christian homes. Why this evasion on the part of so many Bible periodicals?

There can be but one reply, the editors of these so-called "evangelical" publications have been bluffed into silence. Modernistic teachers in our schools, and many archæologists seeking fame, have adopted such a shrewd method of "proving" their dogmas, as to man's existence on earth and kindred questions, that these timid editors and many ministers

in the pulpit are fearful lest they run up against a stone wall.

For instance, when a skull or thigh bone is discovered, beneath a few feet of gravel or in an ancient cave, it is immediately announced that the find is at least 50,000 years old. The timid preacher, editor or teacher, who is looked upon as a believer in the inspiration of the Bible, realizes that he has no means at hand to ascertain the age of the newly discovered relic, so he allows himself to conclude that possibly the other fellows do know its age, and fearing that he might be classed as an ignoramus, he remains silent.

Why not adopt the wiser course, that of demanding, first of all, that the discoverer and the college professor who accepts the story of the find as true, that they furnish proof of the age of the relic, and absolutely refuse to be disturbed by it until they do? Such a procedure would place all these bones in the dump heap where they belong. Some Christian people are altogether too gullible!

As an illustration, suppose a "noted scientist" should assert that the first human pair on earth had come from the planet Mars, and succeed in having his statement inserted in all the school books. Thereafter if a Bible student hesitated to accept it, the college professor might ask the student, preacher or editor to prove that the first pair did not come from Mars.

That is the tactic of the Modernist, and it puts a whole multitude of Bible adherents to flight, and when their coat-tails disappear around the corner, the Modernist repeats that other unanswerable argument, "everybody believes the first human came from Mars 50,000 years ago."

The educational books in our colleges are full of just that thing, and it convinces a whole lot of fickle people who allow others to do their thinking.

Why not turn the tables by demanding that those who manufacture the "man from Mars" theories are the ones

to furnish the evidence that man did originate there, and refuse to give the theory the least credence until such proof be furnished?

Several years ago, I picked up a college textbook that had been placed in the hands of one of my sons from which he was expected to imbibe ancient history. On one of the early pages was this statement:

When the curtain of history first rises, about 5,000 B.C., there were nations already venerable with age.

The author produced not one fact to substantiate such an untruthful statement, and yet, no doubt, the professor insisted that the student accept it as true.

The textbooks are full of just such untruthful pronouncements concerning history, chronology, anthropology and prehistoric man. The student from the Christian home is expected to swallow, without question, all such nonsense, and he has no place to go to get the truth.

Our Bible periodicals ought to furnish the student just what he needs to defend himself and enable him to cast aside everything of the kind that tends to undermine his faith in the Bible. The student ought to be informed that it is up to his teacher to furnish the proof to substantiate all such anti-Bible theories. The Bible is the oldest textbook in the world, and it is up to the one who denies its truthfulness to produce his evidence.

Here are five explicit teachings of Genesis, nothing plainer in the Bible, and he who pretends to believe the Scriptures to be the inspired Word of God, has no more privilege to deny these than he has to refuse to accept John 3:16. The Modernistic college professor assumes that these five statements are untrue, and while he is wrong in his conclusions, he expects his students to reject what the Bible tells them.

(1) Gen.1:27, "And God created man in his own image."

(2) Gen.5 and 11 (added to authentic time since then) says it is 5939 years since Adam's creation.

(3) Gen.7 tells us a world-wide Flood

destroyed all mankind, 2348 B.C., except eight persons, miraculously saved.

(4) Gen.9:19 says that from the three sons of Noah have come all earth's races of men.

(5) Gen.10 tells us all nations, including Egypt, have originated since 2348 B.C., and consequently no nation has a history that reaches more remote than 4,283 years back of 1935 A.D.

Every evangelical Christian believes and, if he is brave enough and is sufficiently educated, he defends Genesis. Our Christian students look to such people to furnish them the facts sufficient to meet the false teaching they come up against in most modern schools of learning.

Let me discuss point (1). What proofs, if any, do false teachers adduce to overthrow Genesis as to whether man was a creation? Remember that assertions and theories are not proofs. A whole multitude of men may yell at the top of their voices, "Genesis is false," but what of it?

I stop right here and ask you to name one plausible proof of man's descent from the ape or from any sort of animal life. You may say that man has many animal characteristics. I admit it. The frost on the window pane has all the appearance of trees, but who, for that reason, would hold that the frostings were an evolution from plants or trees; or vice versa?

Have not skulls and other human bones been found under old deposits or in ancient caves, that certainly came from men who were mentally and physically inferior? Certainly, but that has always been true, is true today. The discoveries of these deficient bones do not stop to tell you that in the same vicinity better skulls were also found.

In a "Poor House" in a certain county in Ohio where I lived, was a man with a face and head like that of an ox. Had that cranium been discovered in some ancient cave, what a proof of evolution! This animal-man lived this side of fifty years ago.

It is admitted by all advocates of evo-

lution that among the heads of ancient men, all kinds of skulls, femur and chin bones are found. A deformed skull five thousand years ago is no more proof of evolution than the same kind of bone walking around on two legs today.

They call our attention to the Trinil Pithecanthropus, the Neanderthal and the Piltdown skulls, men of 5,000 years ago, possibly, but the same shaped skulls are carried around in the backwoods of Australia today. What does all this prove? Only that in all ages the out-of-the-way places are inhabited by the more degraded.

Beside all this, it is admitted that in every case of finds of what is claimed to be ancient human bones, there are elements of doubt of their being ancient at all. This is true of the Trinil bones found scattered over quite an area, and evolutionists are still quarreling among themselves whether they all belong to the same individual or whether they are human bones at all.

One quotation as to whether evolution has been sustained, I take from an ultra evolutionist, Schumucker's *Man's Life on Earth*, published in 1925.

There is yet not much proof of man's evolution (p. 26); how delighted would the evolutionist be if an undoubted missing link could be found (p. 24); Don't know what geologic age the Pithecanthropus bones were found (p. 28); Much dispute as to bones of Piltdown, whether ape or human (pp. 31-54).

Let the advocates of evolution fight among themselves, but do not let such things disturb your faith in God's Word, the Bible! Is it not almost beyond belief that many "evangelical" editors are in hiding, thinking Pithecanthropus is pursuing them?

Point 2. What evidence have those who dispute Genesis as to the length of time that has gone by since the first human trod the earth? Some say that it is 10,000, some 100,000, and on up to 500,000 and a million years, since the first animal had advanced sufficiently to be called a human. But the mere fact that all these figures are given is enough of itself to discredit the whole theory, and

that is what it is, nothing but a theory.

Suppose a family that had charged a neighbor with robbing their hen roost, would, in court, give such diverging testimony as to the date of the theft, one saying that it occurred last night, another that it was last year, and on up to fifty years ago. The owner of the hen-roost said the thief was straight of limb but had a very receding forehead, while his wife said that the thief was very bow-legged and was normal as to forehead but had a very protruding chin. Then I hear the judge say, "Case dismissed!"

Right here I challenge any advocate of the theory that man was on earth 10,000 years ago or more, to name any man, other than Bible names, who lived as much as 5,000 years ago. The entire claim that man has been here longer than Genesis tells us, is based entirely and only on theory and hypothesis. There are no facts to back it up.

It is easy to trace all the present races of men back to the dispersion that followed Noah's Flood 4,283 years ago. I have done it in my book, *Naamah and Nimrod*, and my efforts have been in the hands of the ablest historians, including Modernistic and atheistic authors, and there was not one criticism.

Archæology, to say nothing of the Bible, tells us that the eastern continent was pretty well settled back of the Flood, but we have no history of that period except that found in the Bible. We do have much evidence, found in antediluvian caves and under gravel deposits, that man was here in those days, but the proof is just as potent that the ice deposits, and floods that the melting ice produced, precluded the presence of man where his relics are found, until about 6,000 years ago. The melting of the ice gorge in the region of Niagara Falls proves conclusively that man, 7,000 years ago, could not have inhabited that region, and if not there, about the same can be said of Europe and Asia.

Until those who are determined, if

possible, to disprove Genesis, bring forth evidence to that effect, we who believe in that inspired book need lose no sleep. Oh, that our Bible periodicals would furnish our Christian young students the true facts of history and science as to whether they conflict with the teachings of Genesis.

Point 3. Can those who are bent on discrediting Genesis convince anybody that there was no such Flood as that described in the seventh chapter of Genesis? All these fellows are handicapped to begin with, for they all admit that the Ice Age ended in just such world-wide floods.

Another thing they admit is that all the present races of men can be traced back to the Euphrates region at a period not far from 2,200 B. C. The most ancient people, from whom came the yellow races, were the Sumerians who inhabited the Euphrates valley about the date mentioned above. From that valley these people scattered abroad, to Europe, Africa and eastern Asia, and in their travels they never found an inhabitant, but they did find the relics of man under gravel and more often in caves, always with an accumulation of debris over the relics, denoting that there had been a disastrous Flood or floods. There are tens of thousands of proofs that there was such a Flood that all admit, while the enemies of the Bible are at their wits end to overthrow what the book of Genesis tells us.

James Geikie, a noted Scotch historian, in his book, *Prehistoric Europe*, written in 1881, in describing the very earliest men who lived on earth, p.76, says:

A time came when all these animals and Paleolithic men vanished from Europe and were abruptly succeeded by Neolithic men and modern animals. There is thus a gap in the cave history—the accumulation contains no record of this period that intervened between Paleo man and his Neo successor.

Let those of us who believe the Bible is the inspired Word of God, speak and write in such a public manner that the world will know we believe every word

the seventh chapter of Genesis tells us about the Flood in the days of Noah.

Point 4. Is Genesis correct in saying that all of today's races, black, yellow, brown and white, are descended from the three sons of one white man, Noah? On first thought, most of us might wonder whether the black man and the white are of one stock. But that is not a disputed point between those who believe Genesis and those who refuse to pin their faith to the words of the first book of the Pentateuch. Except a very few extreme evolutionists, there is a unity of belief that all present day races are from one human pair. Therefore the problem of how both the white and the colored races developed from one human father, need not to be discussed here. The black man is later than the white. In the oldest centers, like Egypt and the Euphrates valley, the remains of the Negro are never found. In Egyptian history we have to come well this side the first monuments and pyramids before we begin to get glimpses of the Negro type. It is no difficult task to trace the Cushites, the children of Ham, from Shinar, across the Arabian desert, over the Red Sea into Africa where the Negro is first seen. Today's Mussolini-Ethiopians are Cushites, not Negroes.

Ethnologists are a unit in tracing the Aryans who constitute the bulk of the population of Europe, back to Japheth. Another branch of his descendants went east from the plateau of Iran into India, and mingling with the Mongols, peopled the Pacific isles with the brown races. It is even easier to trace the Hamitic races, the first to leave the old Mesopotamic center, north, east, south and west into the more distant regions. It is only a waste of space for me to discuss this feature because there is no dispute here.

There are plenty of Bible critics who will not listen to limiting the time in which the Bible says this divergence of the races took place, but that feature of Bible criticism will be taken care of in my discussion of point 5 when I show that the nations that these sons of Noah organized in Mesopotamia, Egypt and

elsewhere, all were this side of the date of Noah's Flood.

To clinch the above arguments, as to all present races having come from one forefather, let me quote from a couple of authorities, both of them being classed as inclining toward atheism: Schumucker, an evolutionist author, from whom I have already quoted, p.250, "All races are from one species." The *Enc. Brit.*, 11th edition, under "Anthropology," says, "On the whole, it may be asserted that the doctrine of the unity of mankind stands on a firmer basis than in previous ages." That edition of the *Enc. Bri.* is extremely Modernistic throughout. I could quote from a score of such authorities, all unfriendly to the orthodox Bible view, all of them saying that the present races are from one human pair.

To quote from the hosts of able historians, favorable to Bible acceptance, is unnecessary, but I will name two: The late Prof. Wright of Oberlin, than whom there would be difficulty to find one better equipped to testify, says, "The unity and the substantial anatomical equality of the races of mankind become more evident upon careful investigation." Ridpath's *World History*, Vol. 1, p.21. "All men are from one original stock."

Lastly, will history uphold the Bible as to point 5? From 2348 B.C. until now is but 4,283 years. What of it? The enemies of the Bible say that is entirely too short a time for the beginnings of Egyptian and Babylonian peoples! That gives 500 years back of the eighteenth dynasty in which to build the pyramids. The mightiest nation the world has known, greatest in civilization, greatest in agriculture, greatest in architecture, greatest in war (when compelled to go in that direction), greatest in invention, greatest in almost all respects, has accomplished all its greatness in ten thousand years. Less than 5,000, or even 1,000! It is the United States of America. It does not take 700 years to build a half dozen pyramids. Those who oppose Genesis as to the age of Egypt and

Babylon, must drop speculation and talk facts. Those who believe the Bible deal in facts, and never take to their heels when real history and archæology are discussed.

Mesopotamia is universally acknowledged to be the place where the Neolithic, that is the descendants of the sons of Noah, first lived. From there they migrated to all parts of the earth. So the oldest postdiluvian kingdoms and peoples were in the Euphrates valley. If we determine how long ago that was, we can drop the discussion of the antiquity of all the other nations of the earth, if only we can approximate the age of Babylon, or Shinar, as that region was first called.

How old is Babylon? The first authentic date (outside Bible dates) is the reign of Hammurabi, 1900 B.C., perhaps the most ancient secular historic date that can be produced. Back of Hammurabi there were in the Mesopotamia valley only what is called "city states," which means about the same for the Euphrates valley as "Indian tribes" meant when Columbus first visited America.

How much do we know concerning the history of the Indians for the 400 years back of the first white settlement in Virginia in 1607? The Sumerian Babylonians were possibly farther advanced educationally 2,200 B.C. than the Indians were when Columbus discovered America, but they, like our Indians, kept no data from which we can figure out how long they had been there after the Deluge. In America, tribes may have existed side by side or, sometimes, one followed a former tribe, so they furnish us no chronology.

The same is true as to these Sumerians, and therefore it is the height of folly for Christians to abandon the chronology of Genesis because of years figured from Sumerian occupancy of the Euphrates valley. If we must guess the length of time from Hammurabi back to the Flood, what shall our guess be, 100 years? Or shall we say 1,000? Will those of us who believe Genesis to be inspired, be stampeded by guesses and theories?

I for one, intend to stand my ground until facts show me beyond dispute that Genesis is wrong, then, along with that ancient book, go the other 65 Bible books, and I am cast adrift.

The atheist or Modernist, intent on discrediting Bible chronology, generally mentions Egypt, because he can say the pyramids were built 9,000 years ago, and you have no data to prove or disprove it, neither has he. If he had said 50,000, you could not prove they were less ancient, if you were confined to Egyptian chronology, for Egypt kept none. We learn from outside contact, pretty accurately the history of Egypt back to 1600 B.C., beyond that it is all guesswork, except the hints we get in the Bible.

If left to Egyptian records alone, we would be at a loss to give the age of any Nile city, king or event back of 1,000 B.C., except as that valley came in contact with some country that had a fixed chronology. We know from the history of Jacob's family something of Egypt from 1706 B.C. until the Israelites left there in 1491 B.C., but it is meager, indeed. For a century or more from 1400 B.C. back, the kings of Babylon and Egypt kept up a correspondence, and in that way we get a pretty definite chronology of Egypt back to 1,600 B.C., but beyond that there are not data sufficient to overthrow anything, let alone the Bible.

The intent of this article is to instil into our leaders a more militaristic attitude toward those who are undermining faith in an inspired Bible.

As the professors in most modern colleges are so insistent that their pupils subscribe to their anti-Bible instruction, they must have an abundance of genuine proofs to back up their teachings. What are they? I could quote many testimonials by evolutionists who admit there are no proofs for evolution that will stand the test. Here are three, all from evolutionists: Schumucker, the evolution author from whom I have quoted, says: "Just when man became human cannot be told;" and, again,

"Don't know in what geologic age the Pithecanthropus bones were found . . . some anatomists claim these are bones of an idiot;" and, "Actual proof that man evolved is scant."

Ambrose Fleming, president of Victoria Institute of Great Britain, on Jan. 14, 1935, said in his address, "Darwin's theory of evolution of man from monkey was a product of the imagination."

Dr. Hrdlicka, of the Smithsonian Institution, is reported by Thomas Henry, correspondent for the *Washington Star*, March 28, 1934, "Man is neither a brother nor a descendant of the great apes, based upon an accumulation of new evidence from thousands of bones." That ought to quiet us as to any injury the question of evolution can do to disprove Genesis.

What real proofs have the enemies of Genesis to overthrow point 2, that man has been on earth more than 6,000 years? Their evidence, such as it is, proves to be quite plentiful, and I will quote a half dozen samples:

Sir Arthur Keith, an avowed evolutionist, in his *New Discoveries Relating to the Antiquity of Man*, 1931, p.27: "The Peking man (newly discovered old bones) lived 250,000 years ago." That alone ought to squash Genesis! The same author, p.40, "The age of the African skulls (more old bones) is based on flints alone." This is a second death blow to Genesis. Dr. Hrdlicka says, "The earliest fossil yet recovered, belonging to the human family stem, is the grotesque Pithecanthropus found in Java. He lived only a little more than a million years ago." What overwhelming evidence! Yes, and you will believe it when you read the following:

A Washington, D. C., daily of April 29, 1935, had this, "The Interior Department has added to its collection of geological specimens, a louse said to be 30,000,000 years old." No doubt Dr. Hrdlicka saw that announcement and took that louse to be a human louse, and if so, that settles it, that man too was here 30,000,000 years ago!

Here is another announcement that

proves evolution beyond question, but is from another angle. The *Herald* of Washington, D. C., Aug. 2, 1935, says:

You never could guess the animal that Dr. Osborn says started humanity on its way. It was a fish, that existed 300 million years ago, that may be found in the old red sandstone of Scotland. That fish had two round eyes on its forehead, a third eye on top of its head. Dr. Osborn says it is foolish to talk of monkey and baboon ancestors, we came from a three-eyed fish.

Some, perhaps, would rather descend from a three-eyed fish than from a two-eyed monkey.

This evolution theory is growing rather amusing, so here are two more samples: On Feb. 24, 1935, this appeared in the daily press: "The skeleton of a child was found near Irkutsk that dates back 30,000 years." That discoverer was rather modest. Those of us who have been a little curious just how they arrive at the age of an ancient bone, will quit wondering when we read the April 23, 1935 announcement of Dr. Osborne, "After years of intensive work, (says the reporter) he has been able to trace the great 50,000,000 trek of the elephant race from its original home in South Africa over most of the known world." Those evolutionists who can so easily track an elephant fifty million years, can certainly trace man 500,000 years!

But what astonishes me is that the evolutionists do not believe it themselves, as the following quotations, all by evolutionists, show: Bryant's *Popular History*, p.11, says: "If there be a pile of flints, old and young, no one could pick up one and assign its age within a thousand years." Dr. Hrdlicka, Nov., 1934: "Among present day inhabitants of the United States are Neanderthal skull types that would easily deceive any but an expert." That shuts out all Bible students since not one of them is an "expert."

A published report of explorations in New Guinea says of its inhabitants, "Though they do not live in caves, they use the same sort of stone axes the European cave men did." The evolutionist

might as well then drop the flint argument to prove that man lived on earth more than 6,000 years ago. The *Washington Star* of April 11, 1935, quotes Hrdlicka: "The shape of the skull is constantly changing, so is no longer accepted as a key to race." Therefore, another of their theories that man is an evolution or that he has been on earth longer than Genesis says, falls of its own weight.

The point 3, of the disputed sayings of Genesis, is that a Flood destroyed mankind 2348 B.C. except eight persons miraculously saved. It is unnecessary that I discuss the fact of such a Flood, for that fact is accepted by the evolutionists themselves, the only dispute being as to when it occurred.

Prof. F. A. Mitchell, of the British Museum, said, as reported in the press of Feb. 10, 1935, "The Flood, dim accounts of which exist in the folklore of all races, actually occurred. It was, in fact, caused by a cataclysm of the earth's surface, probably continental in extent." Open any treatise on geology and you will find pages describing the floods that prevailed when the ice-melting occurred following the Ice Age.

But how long ago was that? But a few hundred years ago ice covered northern lands that are free of ice now. Let me quote some evidence that shows that we are yet in the melting period. P. E. Mathes of the *Geographical Survey*, April 26, 1935, says:

Ice is being driven from the high mountain strongholds at a rate almost twice as fast as had hitherto been recorded. . . . From 1850 to 1860 the rate of melting was 20 feet a year, from 1880 to 1890 it was 50 feet a year.

I quoted elsewhere that 6,000 years ago the Niagara region was uninhabitable because of ice, and floods caused by melting ice. Why did the yellow people of Asia delay their crossing Behring Strait until long after the Christian Era? Why were there no Indians in America until a few hundred years ago? Simply because mountains of ice covered those sections of Siberia and Alaska bordering on the passage to America.

The man who abandons his belief in the inspiration of the Bible because of the account of Noah's Flood, "will run when no man pursueth."

In point 4 Genesis asserts that the descendants of the three sons of Noah repopled the earth. I know of nobody who traces any tribe to any other progenitor than one of the trio, Shem, Ham and Japheth.

Although there is no dispute as to the fact that all today's race started out from the Mesopotamia center, near where Noah's three sons alighted from the Ark, yet I will append a few historical notations. Keep in mind that the earliest postdiluvian peoples that history discloses in the Euphrates valley were the Sumerians. Therefore when a quotation says a certain race came from the Sumerian region, it is the same as saying they are descendants of Ham or Semites who had mingled with the sons of Ham.

Haddon, p.19, "The earliest civilization of the world arose north of the Persian Gulf among the Sumerians." Prof. Wright, late of Oberlin, Ohio, p.441, "It is significant that the original center of the human race is located by the Hebrew Scriptures somewhere in the vicinity of that place which has been indicated by all scientific inquiry."

In my book, *Naamah and Nimrod*, p.92, I make the following statement, which, since it was published, has never been disputed: "That stretch of country from central India west to Elam, then through Arabia, across the Red Sea into Abyssinia and Nubia in Africa, was anciently called the 'Land of Cush' and the people are referred to in the Bible and among the Greeks as Ethiopians, but they were not Negroes, but as they penetrated south into Africa, they degenerated into real Negroes."

Ridpath, pp.505,508: "The Dravidians are probably the oldest of the brown races. . . . They are traced back almost to the Persian Gulf."

Worcester, p.576: "The Greeks learned to build from the Cushites who were there first."

The Greeks are, as nearly all Europeans and Americans, descendants of Japheth; while there is no dispute anywhere but that the Hebrews, Phoenicians and present day Arabs are children of Shem.

These quotations assure us that the Bible is exactly correct in saying that Shem, Ham and Japheth reseeded the earth after that universal flood that coincided with the melting of the Ice Age accumulations.

Lastly, has Egypt, Babylon or any other nation or people a continuous history extending farther remote than 2348 B.C., the Genesis date of the Flood, that necessitated a reseeded of the earth?

Must we admit that Genesis is wrong as to point 5? This is one place where the Modernist college teacher takes it for granted that his pupils will not talk back. In the discussions that arise in history classes studying the rise of ancient Egypt, the student expects no help from "defenders of the Bible," for they are absent when that subject is the topic. Here are some of the unproven vagaries that the professor dishes out to the Christian young people under him:

Kean, p.482, quotes Oppert as saying Egyptian civilization extends back 11,500 years. Breasted's *History of Ancient Egyptians*, p.15, "4241 is the earliest date." The earliest mythical ruler, Menes, is placed by Mariette, a French author, at 5004 B.C. We could tell of many other unsupported wild statements, but let me give some contradictions, some good and others worthless.

Breasted, 1911, p.viii, as to Babylon, "We possess no monument of Babylon older than 3000 B.C." Webster's Dictionary, p.vi, "Civilized life is already carried on 6000 B.C. in Babylonia." What if the college professor should find such a contradiction in Genesis! Hunt up some histories of the beginnings of peoples in Egypt and Babylonia and see the contradictions, then turn with confidence to Genesis, and face its traducers with boldness.

Goodspeed, 1912, p.50: "Babylon furnishes the most ancient authentic record

known," but Breasted, 1911, p.443, says, "It is highly improbable we possess a single Babylonian document older than 3000 B.C." As some relics in the lowest layers in the Euphrates valley are known to belong back of the Flood, no stronger evidence of the truth of point 5 is needed than this combined testimony of Goodspeed and Breasted.

I am hoping our Christian young people, now in attendance at college, will, after reading this article, write the editors of all weekly, monthly, and quarterly Bible periodicals urging them to publish articles defending Genesis as to the five points discussed in this article. There is one publication, CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE, that needs no urging. That quarterly lets the world know that it is not afraid to defend the chronology, anthropology, ethnology, history and Flood statements of Genesis.

I close with the following quotation from *The Samaritan Pentateuch*, by that very able Bible scholar, J. Iverach Munro, of Edinburgh University, September 1911:

We seem so hypnotized by theories regarding the age of the earth and the age of man, . . . The rising tide of evidence, palaeological, philological and historical, has swept away the dam erected with the materials of half-truths, misapprehensions and sometimes sheer want of knowledge. The ocean-tide of truth is in and will no more go out.

Washington.

Facts Distinctive of Christianity

The finest writers are Christians.

The most eloquent orators are Christians.

The best-contented people are Christians.

The model soldiers are Christians.

The greatest scholars are Christians.

The highest civilization is Christian.

The discoverers of undisputed facts of the highest importance are Christians.

The most orderly society is Christian.

The judge on the bench that has the most respect is Christian.

The man that influences other men most is Christian.

The Library

BETHEL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA

Heroes who Redeem the Times

C. H. BUCHANAN, D.D., RICHMOND, KENTUCKY

HOW often men have lived whose times and work on earth seem to have been by special, divine appointment. Like Queen Esther, they, in their troublesome times, "came to the kingdom for such a time as this" (Est. 4:14). Such men have been a hiding-place from the winds, a shelter in the time of storm, like "a great rock in a weary land."

Nor can we suppose that such men were only acting, conscious at the time that they were taking a stand of high heroism, of great worth to the world. No; they were true men, meeting the issues of life as they came, regardless of themselves. They were true to truth as the emergency arose, and, "counting their lives not dear unto themselves," they were pitted against the evils of the hour, and were victorious.

So often, at the cost of their lives, these men established principles which have become very dear to us and have richly enhanced our times. Need we hesitate to make mention of such deeds of heroism in this our day, and should we allow such noble deeds to be forgotten? If so, we show ourselves unfit to inherit the influence which has enhanced the texture of our times.

The Needs of the Day

Have we need for such displays of heroism in our day? Yes, on every hand, but more especially in an atmosphere where we should least expect to find it. One would expect that in the college atmosphere such heroism would be ever present; but it seems next to impossible to safeguard the most sacred doctrines and trusts left for religious benefits. In some cases not only the wishes of the benefactors have been forgotten, but the clearly expressed and recorded will of the donors have been set aside.

In justification of such conduct it is sometimes said: "We are sure that if

the donors were present, they would sanction the deed." Others say: "The times have changed; there has been a revolution; we must keep up with the times." Thus honesty and fidelity are forgotten, and a stipulated contract becomes a "mere scrap of paper."

In one instance of which we have knowledge, the trustees refused to endorse the deal and would not act. But the school property was sold, and the seminary moved to a distant city, and associated with another college directly contrary to the desires of the benefactors. This brought forth a stinging rebuke from the Supreme Court of the State. But the school went on functioning. All honor to those trustees who would not be parties to such malfeasance of their trust!

The safeguarding the truth against invading false doctrines seems to be even more difficult still. A teacher's lips cannot always be under lock and key. He must be allowed to be himself and think; but for honor's sake he himself should be faithful to his trusts. Where his opinions clash with his contract he should step down and out.

Timothy Dwight at Yale

Where is there a greater example of one redeeming the times than Dr. Timothy Dwight at Yale in the latter part of the eighteenth century? Yale was originated by Elihu Yale, a great man, in 1701, as a Divinity School at Sudbrook, Connecticut. It was removed in 1816 to New Haven, and became Yale College. In 1887 it became Yale University. Its religious feature has always been prominent.

But just after the Revolution French infidelity was in the air and "Tom Paine Clubs" were organized in many of the colleges. About that time Dr. Dwight became president of Yale. He did not hesitate to attack the prevailing skepti-

cism in class discussion, in chapel talks and in a series of sermons lasting for six months. Skepticism was his one theme. Many of the students were very ungodly; many of them were infidels; but under Dr. Dwight's influence religion came to life; infidelity hung its head and hid.

Today we honor Dr. Dwight for his firm and heroic stand. He was a true man, and would not betray his trust. The result was a great revival in which practically all the students became converted and many of them entered the ministry. Thus a great nation-wide revival originated, due to the influence of one man who would not betray his trust.

Bright days followed by dark days came in Germany, as well as in England and America, yet out of the struggle have come heroes. In the days of Pastor Francke at Halle University, a great religious work was accomplished. The University had a great religious faculty, as Andover once had, and a student body of 1,500. In twenty-nine years as many as 6,000 clergymen were sent out, an average of 200 a year. Besides this, the Francke Institute was founded with a school for orphans. All this made Halle University famous.

But along came the "*enlightenment*" wave, and in many instances religion had to take a back seat. The "*enlightenment*" was a rationalistic wave which originated with the Reformation, and the skeptical class were in the ascendancy. True, the education of the people had long been neglected; but this was a Church blunder which did not represent true Christianity. Yet Voltaire in his skeptical rage against the Church because of the corruptions which were common in his day, did not make the distinction between human weakness and real religion, and the Church generally had to bear the brunt of Voltaire's tirades.

This same "*enlightenment*" reached Germany, and Leibnitz fathered the strife, and Christianity was made to appear as an enemy to education, which is

a glaring mistake. Christianity has always been a friend to the right kind of education and the mother of many colleges.

In the days of the "*enlightenment*" Halle's influence waned. Under Gese-
nius and Wegscheider the holiest things of the Bible were held up to ridicule, and every attempt was made to uproot its influence. A member of the faculty proposed to the seminary that "Christianity be set aside to make room for a better religion," and every one present voted in the affirmative.

A student reported that "they diligently sought to root out all regard for the Bible and its influence." Another said that he had never heard a quickening, edifying word from the theological chair. When Henstenberg wrote up the conditions at Halle, he was denounced as "attempting to check the freedom of teaching."

Tholuck at Halle

When Dr. Tholuck went there in 1826, his appointment was opposed by the faculty. "He began his work as a solitary on Patmos." When he expressed some evangelical sentiment, the students left the room. People were incited against him as a hypocrite. But he would not yield; with gentleness of spirit and firm conviction, he continued on his path of duty, in spite of all opposition.

But this began to give way, and because of his messages and influence, long before his death in 1877, he saw the university in sympathy with the evangelical religion. A multitude of students went out to disseminate the truths which he had so fervently taught them in personal conversation, in the pulpit and from his theological chair.

A man like Tholuck in all her seminaries would have saved Germany many a sorrow. It would have saved many an American who sent his son to Germany for a finished education, the heart-ache of having his son to return an atheist, eventually to commit suicide, as in the case of my old university seminary Dean.

Such college degeneracy is not confined to Germany; it is world-wide. In our fair land, why are the religious class spoken of as being "dense" and as being "obscure," or some such offensive epithet? There is a popular sentiment that only a skeptic can have a finished education. And where is there an effort to put down this calumny? Why should one who has lost faith in God and His Son be called "scientific," as if there were no orthodox religious scientists, or scientific Christians. There are many of them who are not skeptics.

F. D. Maurice in England

The heroism of fidelity was not confined to Germany. A half century later, John Frederick D. Maurice (1807-1872); a son of a Unitarian preacher, after graduating from Cambridge, became converted to orthodox Christianity, and took orders at Oxford in the Church of England. He was employed at Oxford University, and espoused the cause of vital godliness and practical religion.

Such a stand would naturally be unpopular in the High Church atmosphere at Oxford. So he had but a few to hear him at first as he delivered his warm, heartfelt sermons. He took the position that religion was suited to the highly learned as well as to less favored people. Then he urged a religious care for the poor and needy. His audiences gradually grew till there was not room to seat them; and he became recognized as one of the greatest preachers of the day.

He became the foremost leader of the Broad Church of England, the admitted successor of Thomas Arnold of Rugby. By his influence a school for girls was started in London. He became recognized as the friend of all. The Queen became his friend and patron, and had him appointed in 1860 incumbent of the district church of Vere Street, Marylebone.

In 1866 he was honored with a call to the chair of Moral Philosophy at Cambridge. He died at his residence in London, in 1872, the object of universal ad-

miration, and loved by some almost to idolatry. These feelings culminated at his death in a display of feeling rarely given to others.

He was one of the originators of the Christian Social Movement, the design of which was to break down the system of competitive labor, and elevate the working class by teaching them to associate together in little companies, undertaking work in common and sharing the proceeds. He also took deep interest in the education of women. In fact, there were few subjects of importance to which his sympathies did not extend. As a writer the ink on his pen was scarcely ever dry.

Compare his life and labors with some university men of today, and what a painful contrast! Here was one born in an unorthodox family, who became a noted and beloved orthodox Christian, whose effort was to take religion to the educated class and education to the common people. From this same stamp of people here in America we have most of our Modernism and denial of vital piety. Here such men are a hindrance to vital Christianity.

In England, Maurice was a hero to redeem the times. He would not betray his trust in his Lord, and as a result, he became "worshiped almost to idolatry." Would to God we had millions of such men all over the earth, to lift up Christianity and to save the day!

Any one will admit that the poor should have the Gospel and its benefits; but why not let the university man enjoy religion also? And why should he not be a friend to vital godliness, rather than an enemy and a hindrance?

At one of the southern universities the president, a LL.D., Ph.D., and a layman, was seen down on the grass earnestly talking to one of the students. His fellow-students later said to him: "What was the President after you about?" "After me? why, that man was talking to me about my soul."

Why not? There was no Modernism in that atmosphere, but there was manly

religion on every hand, as it should be at every institution of learning. Here was one who did not betray his trust, and few men were honored and loved more than he—Robert Samuel Hyer.

There are multitudes of such true men in the Church today, if we only knew them. The daily press rarely mentions such faithful men; yet the treacherous and the tricky are played up in great sensational headlines. The noble and the true are rarely mentioned. They do not furnish sensational news; therefore, they are left unsung and unremembered by the thoughtless public. But these are the men who save the world; they are the salt of the earth.

Great Men as Landmarks

We speak of great men as being "landmarks of the age." Why? Simply because they were not to be "driven by the winds and tossed." They would not trim their sails to catch the popular wave. A "trimmer" has always been a term of contempt, and deservedly so. What the world needs today is men of character and force to lead their fellows aright.

Americans are called "good followers where they have good leaders." While this may be true, there is great danger in following a brainless leadership. While there is wisdom in being tractable, yet there is possibly the greatest danger in being like unthinking sheep to follow the crowd no one knows whither. The world must have "organized team-work" to accomplish anything worth while. But unless it has wise leaders, the organization becomes a mob to be led by the impulses of the moment, just as we see about us every day.

There is a proverb that "custom makes law," as in the case of social styles in dress and etiquette. Grafters take advantage of this imitative instinct in humanity, to fatten on the stupidity of a gullible mankind. This imitative habit rules the public to a distressing extent. Men seem to dread being "out-of-date" more than they do being out of truth and wisdom; and those who will

not follow the popular crowd have applied to them in contempt the term of "reactionaries."

Yet these men have often saved the day. One has a growing suspicion that many of the colleges have gone adrift in religious matters only because their ambition is to be "progressive and up-to-date," regardless of the right or the possible wrong. On this wave Modernism in religion gets its swing in the public mind, just as evolution got its recognition, though it has never been proven true. Darwinism is being forsaken.

There is an old saying that "the voice of the people is the voice of God." If this be true, the Almighty must often change His mind, especially in election years in America.

People speak of *the times* as if they came to us ready made, and are to be lived unconditionally. But the times are just what we make them, good or bad. If they are bad, the blame lies at our door. The front page of a daily paper is an index of only a class, mostly sensational and evil. The good rarely appear thereon.

There is nothing more discreditable to certain individuals than the skeptical Modernism coming from some of our city school centers. Yet these sentiments do not always represent the whole people of a city. From some of our worst cities have come some of our most triumphant Christians in spite of "the times." To make mention of the many names of such heroes would require pages.

Men try to make it appear that *the times* are skeptical; but they only register themselves. Professor Leuba of Bryn Mawr sent out some 5,000 questionnaires asking for a statement of the science teachers on atheism and immortality. Fifty per cent of the answers were negative, or implied indifference. But Leuba was an atheist and sought to bolster up atheism. The reports were to his liking. But those reports were not a cross-section of American citizenship. They were a reproach to the teaching

profession, showing a condition destined to be weeded out.

Great Consecrated Laymen

From Chicago came one of our noblest evangelists. When D. L. Moody was a dry goods merchant in Chicago, he resolved that "there should be one soul in the city completely given over to the Lord." His light began to shine; he was invited to help in local churches, then in other cities, then calls were made for his services in Europe. Here was a plain layman who knew not a word of Latin or Greek, but who, by simply telling of his faith and religion, shook the nation as no other man had ever done; this, too, at a time when Ingersollism was at its zenith.

It was a blessing to live in the days of Moody and to listen to him. Moody is gone, but his Christ and his religion are still here. The Gospel story will always be victorious when truly told; therefore, let it be told with fervor and fullness around the whole world.

How can one estimate the religious heroism of such laymen as W. E. Gladstone and John Wanamaker? They were standing monuments of the worth and beauty of practical Christianity. As Dr. T. DeWitt Talmage stood holding Gladstone's hand, the latter said: "I have been for forty-eight years in the public service of my country, and I have associated with sixty-three of the rulers of the world, and fifty-eight of them were Christians. The older I get the more I am satisfied with my religion."

His last published volume was *The Impregnable Rock of the Holy Scripture*, being the result of his tilt with Mr. Huxley. In his book, *Ecce Homo*, Prof. J. R. Seeley said: "As long as Christianity can produce a character like Mr. Gladstone it cannot be called a failure." Three times he became the "uncrowned king of Great Britain." In his day he was called "the greatest living Christian!" He redeemed his times.

One of the gems in America's religious crown was John Wanamaker,

merchant, statesman, Christian. Besides being the president of the greatest department store known at the time, he was an active officer in his church, taught a Sunday school Bible class of five hundred young men, yet found time to attend regularly the mid-week prayer meeting, besides responding to various calls of need. His public prayers were considered so excellent that they were taken by a short-hand reporter and published in a book.

In the intimacy of his home, he was asked by a visitor to explain the secret of his success. In a subdued tone he said: "Very early in life I resolved to do business for my Lord Jesus Christ." That explains.

Was it any wonder that, when the nation wanted an efficient Postmaster General, the portfolio was handed to Mr. Wanamaker?

To mention the skeptical Modernists in connection with such superb Christians would be almost sacrilegious. Who shall be the heroes to redeem our perilous times? Surely not the liberalists.

The presumption is that they do not read Christian literature or history, and do not know of the heroes who have kept the fires of true religion aglow on the altars of God. Therefore let the good news be faithfully told, since by telling it the kingdom of heaven is established in the world.

The Sixth Edition

Revised and brought up-to-date, of Dr. Leander S. Keyser's well-known book, *A System of Christian Evidence*, is now off the press, and is ready for distribution. This work has had a fine general circulation, and has also been used as a textbook in many Bible schools, colleges and theological seminaries. Mail orders to CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE. Published by The Lutheran Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa. The price is \$2.25. Special rates in quantities.

When Worlds Collide

JAMES R. RANDOLPH

MOST people have seen shooting stars. Hardly an hour passes, but one or more of these little particles of cosmic dust comes hurtling in from the boundless depths of space, glows for a moment, intensely heated by friction with the air, and then disappears. Some of them land and are found afterwards. Some are of iron and others of stone, but the stone is not of this world.

Within recent years evidence has been accumulating that much larger bodies have occasionally struck the earth; bodies that are in themselves small worlds, and whose impact must undoubtedly have resulted in great and widespread harm.

On an air enveloped planet like the earth the scars of such impacts would gradually disappear. On an airless world like the Moon, they would remain forever, unless destroyed in the making of later scars. Many astronomers now believe that this is the correct explanation for the mountains on the Moon. And, indeed, no other explanation seems really plausible.

Looked at through a telescope, the surface of the Moon is seen to be thickly studded with circular craters, some of enormous size. They are very like shell craters. They are like the marks formed by throwing stones at high velocity into mud. But they differ in many respects from the craters made by volcanoes, especially in their perfectly random distribution, and in the absence of lava flows. They differ, also, in the relations between craters that touch or intersect. Such craters do not coalesce, as volcanic craters would. But the crater most recently formed, whether larger or smaller, appears to have destroyed so much as was necessary of the older one, so that its own formation is complete.

Here and there among the mountains are large flat plains, always of circular or elliptical shape. And the mountains

around these plains look as if they had been partly melted. This, also, is to be expected, as we shall see.

On Mars there are several large elliptical areas having a different appearance from the surrounding country. And both from their shape, and from the direction in which their boundaries are most strongly marked, we are inclined to believe them to be the scars of celestial collisions.

Scars on the Earth

As the largest scars on the Moon and Mars are several hundred miles across, it is natural that similar formations might escape notice on the earth. For here, until the coming of the airplane, it was not possible to see more than a few square miles at a time.

Of smaller scars, but yet much larger than those made by meteorites of ordinary size, several have been discovered on earth and are now pretty generally admitted to be of celestial origin. One of the best known is Meteor Crater, in Arizona. This is a great pit, nearly a mile across and more than five hundred feet deep. The rock strata surrounding it have been broken, bulged, lifted out of place, and, in general, give plain evidence of having been roughly treated by something enormous. The meteorite that did the job is now believed to lie buried under one side of the crater.

In June, 1908, a still larger body, or rather a group of bodies forming the head of a small comet, struck in the wilderness of central Siberia. The shock of the impact was recorded by seismographs. The accompanying atmospheric phenomena were seen as far away as England. But the comet itself was not discovered until twenty years later.

Then explorers discovered a circular area fifteen miles or more across, in which trees had been blown down and scorched as by great heat. At the center

of this area is a large group of elliptical pits, individually smaller than the one in Arizona, but collectively believed to have resulted from the impact of a larger total mass.

The Carolina Comet

Within the last few years the study of airplane photographs in North and South Carolina has revealed evidence of a much larger comet fall. From Norfolk to the Savannah River, a distance of four hundred miles, the coastal plain is thickly studded with formations locally known as "bays." These are depressions, often several miles across, sometimes filled with peat bogs, and rimmed with elliptical ridges of sand.

These "bays" had long been known from the surface. But even the hand-made maps of the region did not reveal their astonishing symmetry, both in shape and in direction, which now leads scientists to believe them the result of celestial impacts.

The long axes of these scars lie quite uniformly parallel, in a northwest to southeast direction. Within the width of the coastal plain, an area of about 40,000 square miles, there are about three thousand of these scars. Southeastward the scarred area extends into the sea, probably covering a total of 190,000 square miles, or more, with a total of more than 15,000 scars.

It is hard to determine the relation between the size of a scar and that of the meteor making it. The energy of these cosmic projectiles is enormous. They would be partly evaporated and otherwise destroyed. And their remains lie deeply buried, beyond the reach of the excavations attempted so far, though magnetometer observations prove the iron is there. Rough approximations, however, indicate that the Carolina Comet may have been equivalent to a globe of iron a hundred miles in diameter.

Twice As Hot As Coal!

The velocity of a falling meteorite has two components: the velocity of ap-

proach, which is independent of the size of the earth, and the velocity of attraction.

The latter is the only one we can find out, except by direct observation at the time. It is the velocity the meteorite would have if it and the earth had been originally standing still in space and had come together solely as the result of their gravitational attraction for each other.

To compute this, assume the meteorite at a distance r from the center of the earth to acquire an infinitely small increment of velocity, dv , in the small time interval, dt . This is given by the equation

$$dv = gdt$$

where g is the attraction of gravitation at distance r .

But, since $\frac{dr}{dt} = v$, we may write this:

$$v dv = g dr$$

If R and G are the radius of the earth, and the gravity at its surface, this becomes, using the inverse square law,

$$v dv = \frac{GR^2}{r^2} dr$$

Integrating:

$$v^2 = 2GR^2 \int_{r=\infty}^{r=R} \frac{dr}{r^2} = 2GR$$

If $G = 32.2$ feet per second per second and $R = 3,959$ miles this becomes:

$$v = 6.95 \text{ miles per second}$$

$$\text{Then the kinetic energy} = \frac{wv^2}{2G}$$

$$= 26,900 \text{ B.T.U. per pound.}$$

By contrast, the heat generated when coal is burned is only about 14,000 B.T.U. per pound, and the heat generated in the explosion of T.N.T. is very much less than this.

What It Was Like

It is hard for us to imagine what would happen when such a large body strikes the earth. Man has made small

projectiles that travel as fast as a mile per second, contrasted with nearly seven for the comet. And the energy of his deadliest high explosives is only a small fraction of that which the comet has by reason of the earth's attraction alone.

Comets usually have atmospheres of their own. This one probably carried with it a large globe of air in addition to the thousands of iron balls that made up its nucleus. As it fell, both atmospheres were enormously compressed, for lack of time to get out of the way. No sound gave warning, for sound is much too slow. The huge piston of masses, heated white hot by their mere compression, plunged earthward with the iron balls behind, and then spread out in a vast tidal wave of air.

To a spectator on the Moon it would have seemed that the atmosphere bulged out in an enormous splash, and then that a ripple of air, possibly a hundred miles or more deep, went rolling around the earth, meeting and coming back again and again, before it finally settled down.

Meanwhile, the huge iron balls were landing. Vast circles of water and sand were thrown out, driving through the compressed hot air until it slowed them down and stopped them, dropping them where the rims are today. The iron drove deep into the rock below. The rock was squeezed and compressed so that it flowed as if liquid. The heat of its moving raised its temperature, how high we do not know. The iron, also, was highly heated. Then the sand fell on, the water rushed back, and rapidly carried the heat away.

For each pound, there were 26,900 B.T.U. to be disposed of; and the whole comet may have weighed 34,600,000,000,000,000,000 pounds!

All Life Destroyed

When air is quickly compressed its temperature rises by an amount which can be computed if the pressure rise is known. We can only guess how high the air ripples produced by the comet would be. But it is reasonable to sup-

pose that they would have raised the surface pressure, momentarily, to, say, thirty to fifty pounds per square inch, instead of its normal value of 14.7. The corresponding rise in temperature, due to adiabatic compression, would reach or exceed the boiling point of water, and would be instantly fatal to all the higher forms of life. It must be remembered, too, that this heat is generated in the air, by compression of the air. Nothing, therefore, can protect air breathing animals against it.

But this is only one of the minor effects of the comet, a merciful blast of death, preventing the slower agony that is to come. For enormous quantities of heat are now being distributed by winds throughout the world. It will be many years before that heat can be radiated off into space. Meanwhile the earth is going to be extremely warm.

The total heat generated by the impact may be written:

$$3.46 \times 10^{19} \times 26,900 = 9.3 \times 10^{23} \text{ B.T.U.}$$

But it takes only 4.1×10^{20} B.T.U. to increase the temperature of the earth's whole atmosphere by about 150 degrees. That leaves plenty more heat for melting polar ice and warming oceans, and insures that temperatures close to the boiling point would probably last, on the earth, for a very long time. It is doubtful if any life exposed to the air would survive.

What This Means to Evolution

The theory that present forms of life arose by evolution from simpler forms necessarily presupposes a very long time for the process, running into millions of years. It also requires that, if all life were destroyed, there would have to be a new beginning, and the age-long process would have to be gone through all over again.

We would then have two distinct series of fossils, one series ending when the comet struck, the other beginning a long time afterwards. It would be possible to date the catastrophe by the fossils, even when no scar had ever been

discovered. And the most exhaustive studies of fossil material give no indication of anything of the kind.

On the other hand, the special creation theory fits the evidence very simply. We need only assume that God created the new world of life very similar to that which had been destroyed, even as man rebuilds a city after an earthquake.

The analogy may be carried further. During the construction or the reconstruction of a factory things are happening, men and forces are present, that are unknown when the factory is complete and in use. So with the world. When it cooled enough for life to exist again, construction forces came from somewhere. They served their purpose for the time, then went away again. Man has never encountered them, and knows no more about them than the girl at the loom knows of steam shovels.

Moreover, the scars of the Carolina Comet are very recent, as geologists reckon time. The disaster may have happened as little as ten thousand years ago! That fits the Bible account, but it does not fit the theory of evolution at all. According to the evolutionist, if such a thing happened ten thousand years ago only the lowest forms of one celled organisms should be found on earth today.

Earth Probably Hit Many Times

But the Carolina formation is not the only one which, to judge from its appearance, may have resulted from the impact of a falling star. The Hawaiian Islands also give this impression. We can imagine a body, solid this time, striking at the northwest end of the submerged shelf from which these islands rise, rolling swiftly along it, disintegrating as it rolls, and finally smashing up at the southeastern end.

The direction of the island chain is one evidence of this. If, before the impact, the comet's path was nearly parallel to that of the earth, the body that was ahead would be slowed down, and thus allowed to go nearer the sun, while the overtaking body would be speeded

up and caused to go farther away. Thus the overtaking body would always approach from the outer side, and would strike with an easterly motion, and also with a motion toward the equator.

Small comets are often composed of many separate particles. But as the mass grows larger the heat generated by new additions becomes sufficient to melt them, and slowly welds the mass together. Hence the larger the body the more solid it becomes.

A body several hundred miles in diameter, striking with not too much of a slant, would probably slump down into a molten pool, and being denser than the surface rocks, would sink to a lower level.

As the pool cooled and solidified the crust would attach itself most firmly to the side from which the body had come—the northwest, in high northern latitudes. And the opposite side, under which the pool was hottest and deepest, would be marked by a semi-circular chain of volcanic islands long after all other marks had been obliterated.

We find two such semi-circular chains of volcanic islands, and each, for its latitude, lies in the proper direction from its center. These are the Windward Islands, closing the Caribbean Sea on the east, and the Aleutian Islands.

In the case of the Aleutian Islands the scar is enormous. Not only does it form such a semi-circle as we should expect. But the earth seems to have split open, along two radiating lines, to let the new material in.

Directly from the center of the circle run two great chains of mountains, one including the Kuriles, Japan, and the Philippine Islands, while the other includes the Rockies and the Andes, reaching down to Cape Horn.

And nearly all the volcanic and earthquake regions of the earth are in these two great mountain chains.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

The Carolina "Bays"—Are They Meteorite Craters?—F. A. Melton and William Schriever. *Journal of Geology*—January-

- February, 1933. (Reprint) Scientific American—September and October, 1933.
- The Comet That Hit the Carolinas—Edna Muldrow. Harper's Magazine—December, 1933.
- Carolina "Bays" and Elliptical Lake Basins—William F. Prouty. Journal of Geology—February-March, 1935.
- The Most Fascinating Spot on Earth—D. M. Barringer, Jr. Scientific American—July, August and September, 1927.
- The Mysterious Tomb of a Giant Meteorite—William D. Boutwell. National Geographic Magazine—June, 1928.
- The Great Siberian Meteorite—Charles P. Oliver, Ph.D. Scientific American—July, 1928.
- Kingston, Rhode Island.

"That Famous Auburn Affirmation"

JOHN V. STEPHENS, D.D.
Cincinnati, Ohio

IN the October number of CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE, Dr. Leander S. Keyser writes on "That Famous Auburn Affirmation." Perhaps the readers of CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE would be interested in knowing that the Presbytery of Cincinnati, Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., in 1924, within a few months after its publication, overtured the Auburn Affirmation to the General Assembly, meeting in Grand Rapids, Michigan. The overture was drawn and presented to the Presbytery by the late Dr. William McKibbin, President of Lane Theological Seminary, and was unanimously adopted by the Presbytery.

The Affirmation was reprinted for distribution at the General Assembly. Dr. McKibbin prepared an able brief against the Affirmation, which was also printed for distribution. It was Dr. McKibbin's purpose to see that the members of the General Assembly were "well advised" on the contents of the Affirmation.

This General Assembly was organized and controlled by the conservative element of the Church. According to the late Dr. F. C. Monfort, editor of the *Herald and Presbyter*, the conservatives were largely in the majority. Dr. C. E.

Macartney, an outstanding conservative, was elected Moderator. The late Hon. W. J. Bryan was Vice-Moderator, and Dr. Maitland Alexander, pastor of the First Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., was Chairman of the Committee on Bills and Overtures. Mr. Bryan was also a member of this committee. These two gentlemen were strong, aggressive conservative leaders.

The Cincinnati overture was referred to this committee for consideration and recommendation. After a careful, prayerful consideration, the committee "recommended that no action be taken." No minority report was presented. The records do not disclose that any member of the committee did not concur in the recommendation. The General Assembly adopted, with apparent unanimity, the recommendation of the committee. Thus it will be seen that the Auburn Affirmation was brought promptly before the General Assembly by an overture, supported by a strong brief against it, and, in a constitutional way, was adjudicated.

The writer is not a signer of the Auburn Affirmation. He writes neither in approval nor disapproval of this document, but simply to call attention to an important fact that seems to have been overlooked or forgotten, namely, that the Auburn Affirmation was adjudicated by a strongly conservative General Assembly eleven years ago.

(EDITORIAL NOTE.—We thank Mr. Stephens for the foregoing information, which we publish in the interest of fairness. However, in spite of the disposition made of the Auburn Affirmation by the General Assembly, we still think that our analysis of that document, as printed in our October number, is correct.—L. S. K.)

I reject evolution because I deem it obsolete; because the knowledge, hard-won since 1830, of Anatomy, Histology, Cytology and Embryology, cannot be made to accord with its basic idea.—Albert Fleischmann, G.R., Professor of Zoology and Comparative Anatomy at the University of Erlangen in Germany.

What Think Ye of Christ?

Whose Son is He?

REVEREND SAMUEL S. BOGAN

IT should be remembered that, when Jesus lived and wrought here among men, the multitudes, who crossed His path and contacted with Him, regarded Him as just a man among men, unusual, it may be, but still a man of their nation and one of their race. Did they not know His mother and brothers and sisters?

Their viewpoint of Him was that of a mere contemporary; therefore, what they thought of Him depended on what they themselves had seen and heard and what others said of Him. Their appraisal would be based on these facts, plus their own power to understand and interpret Him in the light of His words and works.

But human wisdom and natural ability, unaided by revelation from God, could not venture to accord to Him more than a human status and comparative greatness. They could conceive Him to be a re-incarnation of one of the prophets; but by no stretch of imagination could they conceive Him to be the Christ, the Son of God.

The contemporary history of men and nations is often misunderstood and undervalued, for the reason that history in the making is necessarily incomplete and fragmentary, and appears to the contemporary as so many dissociated events and unrelated happenings. Consequently, those only who were the most intimately associated with Jesus as companions, friends and disciples were in a position to make anything like a just and adequate appraisal of His true personality.

It appears obvious that Jesus, while here on earth, was as truly human as He was divine; but necessarily, by virtue of the occasion that sent Him into the world, His humanity was the more evident as the housing of the "Word Made Flesh"; and this flesh is made the one

and only medium of declaring God to the world:

No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him.

It is evident that Jesus emphasized and kept in the forefront His human manifestation, for by it alone could He contact the world. This is the significance of His repeated use of the cognomen, "The Son of man," as when He asked His disciples: "Who do men say I, the Son of man, am?" And again, "For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost."

Hence Jesus as a man among men was the equal, not of one man or of any man, but of *all* men; for He was pre-eminently "the Son of man," in His best estate—holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens. We have no ground to impute to Him a state of nescience as to His coming into the world, nor the manner of His appearing, nor of the purpose of His coming: for these were matters with which He was conversant from eternity. With this view agrees His prayer:

And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.

His manifestation to the world was made by His conscious personal choice. For He took not on Him the nature of angels, but He took on Him the seed of Abraham. To whom He said, In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed (Acts 3:25). Herein God in Christ became the fulfiller of His ancient promise to Abraham, "Not as to seeds, many, but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ."

By the woman He took on Him the seed of Abraham, and in the same instant He became also the seed of the

woman. This is how He became flesh, but not sinful flesh. "God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh." "Herein He was made sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him."

No man can reject and speak adversely of Jesus Christ, and not reject and condemn God: for

God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the words of reconciliation. For this is the record, that God hath given us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.

What follows, then? No man can deal with God independently of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; for "God hath committed all judgment unto the Son: that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father that sent Him."

Besides this, there is a relation that unites the believer with Christ and in Christ with God; the three are inseparable as such.

As thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us. He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me: and he that despiseth me, despiseth Him that sent me.

If we will but receive it! Jesus Christ was God in covenant relation with the world as Redeemer and Saviour. "He is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." Hence His mediatorial and sacrificial work accomplished at Jerusalem was made in behalf of all men. What He did for one He did for all.

The sum of it all is that the Gospel of Jesus Christ is that great salvation which, if any man neglect, he shall not escape condemnation. And no man can possess this great boon without believing on the Lord Jesus Christ.

Salvation is freely offered to all; "for God so loved the world that He gave

His only begotten Son," etc. But lest some persons should read into this, as some do, unconditional salvation,—let them note that the qualifying clause of the "whosoever" excludes all them that believe not. For note:

He that believeth is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.

The words that He spoke and the mighty works He did were deemed sufficient to declare His divine nature and unique mission in the world, and therefore to oblige them to make a personal decision; nor could they shirk the responsibility of personally voicing their conviction as to who He was. The evidence was such as to convince and convict them.

No man can afford to misjudge Jesus Christ. Even though men may place His name among the great, and honor Him as a prophet, and herald Him as a man sent from God, yet they are accounted rejectors of the Son of God and are yet in their sins. Jesus said: "When the Holy Spirit is come, He will convince the world of sin, because they believe not on me." What then? Respecting the plan of redemption in Christ Jesus, the sum total of all sins is unbelief. That men cannot escape the awful penalty of their unbelief—"Ye shall die in your sins"—is clearly shown by our Lord when He said, "Ye will not come unto me, that ye might have life." Again He said:

Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. If ye were blind, ye should have no sin, but now ye say, we see; therefore your sin remaineth. . . . If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not sinned, but now they have no cloak for their sins. If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin: but now have they both seen and hated both Me and My Father. I said, therefore unto you, ye shall die in your sins: for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.

The italicized pronoun "he," in this last statement is a misplaced emphasis that weakens the significance of the "I

Am"—a proper name of God, by the use of which, Jesus most certainly proclaimed Himself the God of Abraham, and the God that appeared unto Moses in the burning bush, saying, "I Am That I Am." "Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, 'I Am' hath sent me unto you." And now to the Jews, He says, "Before Abraham was, 'I Am.'" Evidently, the Jews so understood him, for they say, "For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy: And because that thou being a man makest thyself God."

It was only as the Son of man that Jesus could meet men upon the level of their life and understanding. And herein He subjected Himself to the scrutiny and judgment of men, to be received or rejected of them upon the basis of their own verdict concerning who He was.

There are many among us today who lightly esteem our Lord; who presume to make of Jesus a mere puppet of their own creation. Reducing Him to mere human proportions, they rob themselves and the world of a Redeemer.

Our Lord, while here on earth and associated with man, often assumed the role of an inquirer, but His questions were always sane, pointed and practical. He never asked mere catch questions, nor did He trifle with the sincere desires of men to know Him, for He sought to be known of them as the Christ, the Son of God. So it was, in leading out His disciples and establishing their faith, and forcing them to express their personal convictions, He asked the vital question: "Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am?" The readiness with which they made answer, shows that they were alert, and observant, and were conversant with current opinions, respecting the Master. So it was not without some pride that they told Him what they had heard: "Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets."

In the light of their answer it is easy to see the import of Christ's question;

for no man can give a clear, concise account of current opinion, or of any live question without forming an opinion, and voicing a conviction of his own. Therefore the intent of the question was to help the disciples to find themselves, and to clarify their convictions. Were they in harmony with the general consensus of opinion? Or would they dare to differ from it because of an inner belief that He was the Christ of God? Yet seemingly they hesitated to affirm their convictions. In the meantime there must have gone on deep searching of heart that struggled to vent itself in open avowal.

That Jesus was aware of this struggle is apparent from His next question: "But who say *ye* that I am?" That question relieved the situation and opened the floodgate of their souls. Peter voiced their answer: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

In this confession the great truth concerning Jesus Christ stands out in its sublimity and fullness.

You will call to mind that, at the first, these men had left all their worldly prospects—home, friends and business—to follow Jesus, and had literally staked their all upon what they themselves appraised Him to be. In the main, this appraisal was based upon the current opinions and interpretations of the Rabbis concerning the work, character and reign of Messiah, the Son of David, who would set up at Jerusalem the kingdom of David, his Father. Nor did the disciples fully rid themselves of this Rabbinic conception until the day of Pentecost; for even after He had suffered and died and risen again, they came to Him with the question, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom unto Israel?"

But this fact did not invalidate their confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." That Jesus accepted this confession at its face value is a matter of record. And His solemn and sincere commendation of Peter

shows that He recognized both its truth and its enduring place in the Church's faith:

Blessed art thou, Simon, son of John; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

Mark, then, this fundamental doctrine, that Jesus is the Son of the living God—the one and only hope of salvation.

The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into His hand. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.

Obviously, it was this acknowledged and approved declaration of Faith, as voiced by Peter, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," that was made the ground of their preferment, and that immediately preceded their installation as bearers of divine authority and judges in the courts of the Church.

I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

"What think ye of Christ?" is not an academic question, in the main, but one of general purport and applicable to all people: it has always demanded of men their individual avowal or disavowal; in other words, every man must answer the question, and declare himself either for or against Jesus Christ. This demand is binding, not only on the generation contemporary with the Son of man on earth, but also on every succeeding generation. Today men are face to face with the same question, and must answer it.

Believe it or not, one of the most disquieting signs of our times is the almost universal state of purblindness of nominal Christianity regarding the spirit and intent of the Word of God; for, notwithstanding the increase and universal distribution of the Holy Bible, it is becoming more and more a sealed book. The humanitarian and rational-

istic conceptions clothe the Scriptures in human habiliments which hide the truth, and makes the Word of God of non-effect as a spiritual guide to our pathway and a light to our feet.

For instance, awhile ago the writer taught a lesson on Peter's statement, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," to a group of Christians. As we pointed out the real truth and source of that great confession, one member of the class, herself a Sunday School teacher, as well as a teacher in the public school, voiced her surprise by saying: "Why, I always thought Peter said that, because he could think of nothing else to say at the time."

Is Jesus Christ, the Son of man, any better understood today than in the days of His flesh? I fear not; for, as in the days of yore there was a division among the people because of Him, so it is today. Some say He was a man ahead of His own times, but far behind this enlightened age. Others say He was a man of some parts, but was self-deceived, the victim of a grand hallucination: for, while he was the Son of Joseph, He thought He was the Son of God. Some say He was a good man, but others object, saying, "Nay, but He deceived the people." Others say He was the product of His time, but ignorant of science and the problems of today.

There are many, very many, in the colleges, universities and seminaries of the land, who reject God, deny Jesus Christ and ridicule the Holy Scriptures. Their disciples are filling many pulpits of the church, and, parrot-like, repeat what they have been taught. But, thank God, there still are many who both believe and declare that Jesus is "the Christ, the Son of the living God." For the heavenly Father has revealed it even unto them.

Kentwood, Louisiana.

All the progress our fathers dreamed of, and all that we have achieved, are based on the democratic principle of equality.—*William Randolph Hearst.*

For Your Scrap Book

Biblical Criticism

I do not anathematize "criticism," if by that is meant the reverent searching study of God's Book, which, the more microscopic it is, the better. But there is sadly prevalent an irreverent, rationalistic criticism which is also *unscientific*; for, at the outset, it assumes that, in the Bible, there is *no supernatural, superhuman element*. Such a prejudgment disqualifies for an impartial, judicial decision. It implies a mental eye which only contracts the more as more light is poured upon it. The first requisite for Bible study is a candid mind—intellectual and moral honesty, readiness to admit the full force of such an argument as is found, for instance, in predictive prophecy, proving that God is its Author, because no unaided human mind could thus forecast the future; and then equal openness of mind and heart to welcome moral and spiritual instruction, and bow to divine authority, even where our feeble human reason cannot penetrate all the philosophy of divine teaching. Here the greatest minds of history have often found their perfect rest of faith.—*A. T. Pierson, D.D.*

End of the Way

There was a boy traveling through the West and it was a long journey he had over the prairies. It was a day when the sun burned down with tremendous heat. It was a day when the dust was filling the car and everybody noticed that that boy in his loneliness was happier and more contented than all the rest. He looked out over the sand and seemed to see what no one else saw. Finally a lady walked across the aisle and, leaning down to him, said: "My boy, I have been thinking about you today. Do you not get very tired taking this long journey?" "Well," he said, "I

do not think I am very tired. It is hot and it is dusty. It is more than I thought it was going to be, but I am happy. I am happy because father is going to meet me at the end of the journey."—*Cortland Myers, D.D.*

Do We Appreciate the Bible?

To so many this Book is a sort of riddle, a conglomerate of ancient history and Hebrew-Christian lore, of interest maybe, to the scholar, but not to the common run. Yet, with but a few suggestions, the Book can be made to stand forth symmetrical, tangible, reasonably interesting.

It is the story of God's leading from darkness to light, from sin to righteousness, from misery to joy, from a lowly sodden earth to the shining skies. Sin, error, weakness and wickedness are portrayed, but ever the divine finger points away from these things and to a possible better goal.

Ancient and modern, Jew and Christian, temple and church, Moses and Christ—they all have part and place in the story. The way to enjoy the Bible is to read it through as a story of man's upward struggle with God's down-reaching aid.—*Christian Standards.*

Jesus Divine

In the story of Jesus stilling the tempest as Matthew gives it to us in the eighth chapter there is a beautiful flash of insight in the Greek which we do not always get in the English. It wasn't an ordinary tempest or storm as the verse 24 would indicate. The word for tempest is *seismos*, which is seismic, and relates to an earthquake. It had all the force of a tidal wave, and those sudden storms which this lake, nearly 700 feet below sea level, and so placed that it can catch all the concentrated wind from the gor-

es, is famous for. As soon as Jesus subdued this terrific storm the disciples said, "What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him?" We are told that the words "what manner of" should be translated "of what country?" In other words, he was not of any country that they knew of, for no earthly being could do anything like that. They recognized that here was one who came from a country where the inhabitants transcended the power of earth. It is a marvelous argument for the divinity of Jesus.

I think St. Peter, who was in that boat, was so impressed with this that he never forgot it. He used the idea in one of his epistles, "Seeing that all these things shall be dissolved what 'other worldly' persons ought ye to be!"

The Manifestation of Refinement

Matthew 3:2, 3

It is not human nature to be sincere. Human nature is carnal, proud and selfish. Humility is not a trait of the natural human heart. The only humility known to the worldly man is the humility that is proud of its humility. It is not human nature within us that bends our sympathies and drains our compassion, as we witness the need and sorrow of men. Human nature does not minister; it lives to be ministered to. The dross that Christ comes to refine out of us is simply our fallen human nature. When He is through with us, only His nature will appear.—*H. P. Hopkins, D.D.*

The Victorious Life

Revelation 2:7

The greatest battlefields of history are invisible. The arena wherein were gained the most glorious victories is unseen. The history of the triumphs of faith is unwritten to a very large extent. There are two records for every moral conflict—the record on the score card of public approval, and the record on the character of the winner. Sometimes public opinion renders the verdict of defeat, when in reality God, Who reads the heart, sanctions an act with His "well done."

Sometimes success demands too big a price. No one can afford to win at the expense of individual honor. Character is greater than cash. The things of God outweigh the things of gold. Moral waste is the greatest waste in the world. The only kind of a man that God can use and that the world needs is a good man. Morality is the cornerstone of efficiency, and a good conscience the best business asset.—*B. Braunstein, D.D.*

The Hidden Power

We do not try to drag a railroad train by human hands with the use of ropes and chains. We rely upon the hidden power within the engine and not in vain. The failure of the Christian Church to move forward with a continuous advance is due to the fact that we are relying upon human effort to do what only the power of God can do. Christ is the Power of God and He has been given to us to use His Divine Power to meet all the diversified needs of the world.—*F. W. Neve, D.D.*

Chastisement and Sonship

Hebrews 12:6

There is perhaps no one phase or feature of our early lives which stands out so prominently, and which has all through life caused us so many mingled feelings, as the corrections of our early childhood. How hard it was for us in those early days to feel even the justice of it all, much less the mercy and love. But afterward, as we looked back our feeling for the ones who chastened us was at least reverence, and sometimes thankfulness.

And how wonderfully true is this fact of experience to the relationship that exists between us and our Father in Heaven. He may see that it is necessary to send upon us one thing after another, until, like the old Patriarch of Uz, we cry out, "He breaketh me with breach upon breach!"

But man is not a machine, neither is he machine-made; and the Creative Intelligence at work in your life and mine is the God of Love. Now, it is not that

God loves us *because* we have been chastened, for that would savor too much of pity; but He chastens us because He *loves* us. He knows the possibilities within us, and His loving heart cannot be satisfied with anything short of the very best for each one. Chastisements are God's tools for working out His own image in your life and mine.—*I. D. Lytle, D.D.*

A Frowning Providence and a Smiling Face

MEDITATING on that marvelous Romans eleventh chapter, in which God's grace in election is illustrated in His dealings with Israel after the flesh, we recall the Apostle Paul's adoring conclusion in this inspiration of the Holy Spirit: "O! the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out!"

An example of a frowning Providence behind which doubtless God hides a smiling Face, was recently illustrated in the case of Marquis S. Marion de Lavaux who is now living on the U. S. S. "Mercy," used as a shelter, as a ward of the Philadelphia County Relief Board.

Passing strange for a nobleman to have such a home rather than the ancestral castle near Rheims, France. Well can he say in the words of Job in his affliction: "Oh! that I were as in months past, as in the days when God preserved me, . . . when I washed my steps with butter, and the rock poured me out rivers of oil" (Job 29:2,6). Here is a man of distinction, a Knight of Malta, a Count of the Holy Roman Empire and a Marquis (next in rank to Duke and Prince), through heart trouble and other misfortunes, brought to the depths of public charity. A man highly educated, refined, gifted and speaking sixteen languages fluently, and who not long since escaped under sentence from Bolshevik Russia.

Job said under similar trying circumstances, although counseled by his wife to "curse God and die": "naked I came into the world and naked I shall go out . . . shall we receive good at the hand

of the Lord and not evil?" (evil here meaning calamity.) And what says our modern man of high estate, when plunged to the depths? "I can only assure you that I have never forgotten God and that I always believed in Divine Providence." Will it be as well with us if deep misfortune overtakes us?

"Now thanks be unto God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ" (2 Cor.2:14). But someone says: "But does He *always* cause us to triumph?" How about Heb.11:35: "and others were tortured"? That wonderful chapter: Hebrews 11. The marvelous triumphs of faith are enumerated at length: how everybody got what they prayed for. And then, a *turn* in the situation: "and others were tortured," and the words following: "*not accepting* deliverance: that they might obtain a *better* resurrection."

Read this testimony of David in 2 Sam.23: "Now these be the *last words* of David." "And he shall be as the light of the morning, when the sun riseth, even a morning without clouds; as the tender grass springing out of the earth by clear shining after rain." And then he acknowledges in his dying words: "my house be *not so* with God." But still in the triumph of faith he exclaims: "yet He hath made with me an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things, and *sure*." . . . This is all my salvation, and all my desire . . . although He maketh it *not to grow*." Brother David, we understand what you mean, as in our own small experience, it has, also, too much worked out on this wise.

In the words of the Apostle Paul, we may well say: "What shall I more say? for the time would fail me to tell of Gideon, and of Barak and of Samson." The frowning Providence cannot forever nor completely hide His smiling Face: for "when He shall appear, we shall be *like Him*; for we shall see Him as He is" (1 John 3:2): "And they shall *see His face*; and His Name shall be in their foreheads" (Rev.22:4). "And He will wipe away every tear from their eyes" (Rev.21:4).—*Rev. Harold Mackway.*

The Library Table

CONDUCTED BY PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, M.A., D.D.

Approaches to the Study of Revelation

PROFESSOR ELMER E. FLACK, TH.D.

(Through the years we have reviewed quite a number of books on the Apocalypse of St. John. In this number of our journal we call attention to two such works, those of Dr. Abraham Kuyper and Rev. William R. Newell, both of whom advocate the futuristic view of this book of the Bible. In the interest of fairness we publish the following article, so that our readers may see that there is diversity of interpretation. We hope that Dr. Flack's statements will receive the attention they deserve. Dr. Flack is a profound and technical scholar.—L. S. K.)

THE appearance of several recent volumes suggests a brief consideration of the problem of interpreting aright the Apocalypse of St. John. Perhaps no other book of the Bible has suffered more at the hands of commentators than has this document. Varied interpretations of this book, together with the book of Daniel in the Old Testament, have contributed to a large extent to the rise of numerous sects in modern Christendom. It is of paramount importance, therefore, that Christian people in general have a proper approach to the interpretation of the book.

First of all, the Apocalypse is a literary production of a peculiar type. It should, therefore, receive consideration from the standpoint of its peculiarities. When we examine it, we note that it is an epistle, as is indicated by the statement, "John to the seven churches that are in Asia." The writing of epistles was a customary procedure in early Christian times. The Apostle Paul found it a very useful method of dealing with the problems of churches which he had founded at times when it was not convenient for him to appear before those respective congregations in person. Accordingly, he wrote letters, using custom-

ary forms of epistolary address. And in interpreting the Epistles of Paul we are under obligation to take into consideration the occasion and circumstances which called forth the various letters which, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, have become a part of the Canonical Scriptures of the New Testament. We should likewise view Revelation as an epistle which had its origin in a particular crisis confronting the churches in Western Asia Minor in the latter days of the reign of Emperor Domitian, 81-96 A.D., and should interpret it as referring primarily to conditions and circumstances of that time, though fundamentally pointing, as do Paul's Epistles, to the eternal truths of redemption in Christ Jesus.

But Revelation is more than an epistle; it is an encyclical, a circulatory letter addressed to various churches, yet intended for all Christendom. Chapters 2 and 3 purport to be seven letters addressed to as many churches; yet all of these constitute a part of the general epistle addressed to all churches. The use of a pastoral or circulatory letter was not without precedent in early Christianity. It was a device that permitted a writer to present a general message to various churches, without the necessity of tedious copying or re-writing his thought. The Epistle to the Ephesians, in all probability, is such a document. In the Greek the title appears in brackets, indicating that it was designed for various churches. Since Ephesus was the first church on the route of a messenger entering Asia Minor, that destination appears on the copy. A second copy would carry the

name of another Christian community, and so forth. In Colossians 4:16 we read, "And when this epistle hath been read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye also read the epistle from Laodicea."

This note informs us that Paul was accustomed to the sending of circulatory letters, which he designed for use in more than one church. Ephesians may be an introduction to a whole *corpus* of Pauline letters, as its general character would seem to suggest. At any rate, the Pauline practice of universalizing his message for the benefit of various congregations affords us insight into the general circulatory character of Revelation. The author desires that all the churches should benefit mutually by the message reflecting the interests and needs of each. Hence he includes seven purported letters in the one epistle, which he expands into a portrayal of the immediate, yet ultimate triumph of the Church.

But Revelation is more than a circulatory letter, intended for all Christendom; it is a prophecy. Says John: "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear, the words of this prophecy" (1:3). Hence, it bears a relationship to great truths concerning the Messianic Kingdom enunciated by Old Testament Prophets. While the author does not quote passages verbatim from the Old Testament, he employs the phraseology and patterns of prophecy. Usually, prophecy is understood to be largely prediction; but, as a matter of fact, the Old Testament prophets deal largely with immediate situations, yet as presaging the Messianic Kingdom. Viewed in the light of the extent of materials, prediction is a minor element in O.T. prophecy.

So also in Revelation the reference is to an immediate situation. The writer treats of "things which must shortly come to pass" (1:1). Says he: "The time is at hand," viz., when the prophecy is to find fulfilment. In other words, John sees in the crisis before the Church in his day that which logically points to the martyrdom of all Christians. So he writes to the churches concerning the

special blessings awaiting the martyrs and portrays before them the immediate, yet ultimate, victory of Christ and His Kingdom in conflict with the forces of iniquity impersonated by pagan imperial Rome. And those interpreters of the continuous-historical school who make John point primarily to singular events of more modern history, as well as those of the futuristic school, who refer his prophecy to the far distant future rather than to the immediate situation under Domitian, undoubtedly err in their approach to the prophecy. The book has significance for the present and for all future time, not because of its prediction of outstanding events, but because of its utterance of eternal realities of redemption in Jesus Christ.

But Revelation is more than a prophecy of immediate, yet permanent import; it is also an apocalypse, so called in the title. It is, therefore, related to the apocalyptic literature, since it appears, as do its predecessors in the Old Testament and in certain literary works intervening between the Testaments, in the form of symbolism, in which angels, beasts, insignia, colors, cataclysms, etc., play important roles.

In order to interpret these symbols aright, one must approach the study from the standpoint of their use in the Old Testament and succeeding literary works. To divorce the book from apocalyptic literature in general, as many interpreters are wont to do, is to fail to apprehend the significance of the apocalyptic patterns employed.

The Book of Daniel in the Old Testament, the model for later apocalypses, is not so much a prophecy as it is an apocalypse. In the Hebrew Bible it is not listed among the prophets at all. This book provides the initial apocalyptic symbolism centering about Antiochus Epiphanes, who, in his persecution of the faithful, as Nebuchadnezzar did in a former time, typified or personified the sway of iniquity.

The references in Revelation to 3½ years, 42 months, or "times and time and a half of time," for example, point

back in veiled terms to the period of Antiochus as definite assurance of the limited reign of iniquity, and not, as so many have unwittingly supposed, to the duration of the World War or similar catastrophes of modern history.

Apocalypse and prophecy in the Old Testament show many differences in point of view. While the latter is a philosophy of history, the former is a philosophy of religion. As such it employs patterns which lend themselves to the portrayal of the universalities of the faith. It deals, not with the evolutionary processes of history, but with the gigantesque and catastrophic. Apocalyptic was the later successor of prophecy.

However, in the New Testament it is blended with it in the unfolding of the prophetic truths of redemption in universal patterns. When John pronounces a blessing upon him "that readeth" the prophecy, he uses a word in the Greek indicating that the book was intended for use in public lection in the congregations. Hence we may infer that the common people in those congregations

were familiar with the historic symbolism employed for the purpose of confirming truth to the faithful while concealing it from enemies. The apocalyptic approach to Revelation, unfortunately absent in the treatment of so many commentators, is unquestionably necessary for a proper appreciation of the book.

While many commentators present many useful suggestions for Christian readers, they fail to give an adequate interpretation of the Apocalypse as a whole, because of the fact that they do not appreciate the true epistolary, prophetic, and apocalyptic character of the book, which stamps it as one of the most remarkable books, not only in the Bible, but in all literature. Were Revelation understood and received in its true light, many of the sects of Christendom would have no excuse for their existence. For the closer unity of Christendom a deeper understanding of Revelation is needed. May the Holy Spirit more and more unfold to the Church the deeper meaning of this climacteric message of Holy Scripture!

Dr. Day's "Jesus and Human Personality"

REVIEWED BY G. W. RIDOUT, D.D.

THIS book, *Jesus and Human Personality*, contains the Yale Lectures on "Preaching" for 1934, delivered by Rev. Albert E. Day, D.D., of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Baltimore, Md. These lectures were totally different in topic from those given by Simpson, Beecher, Dale, Watson, and Jowett, all of whom dealt with Homiletics primarily. Dr. Day set aside the technique of preaching, and dealt more with Theology, or, more especially, with Christology. Now permit me to say that I think it rather unfortunate that Yale does not keep this lecture course on preaching

specifically on the line of Homiletics, instead of opening it as a channel of opportunity to lecturers to exploit their modern notions on Theology.

These lectures, dealing considerably with Personality, centered greatly in Jesus, but with this characteristic distinction: the Jesus whom Dr. Day advocates is not the Jesus of the Gospel records, nor the Jesus of the miracles, nor the Jesus of the Substitutionary Atonement for Sin, nor the Jesus of Nicea or of the Reformation, nor the Jesus of our fathers—certainly not the Jesus of

Methodism, but the Jesus of the Unitarian school, and more especially of the Shailer Mathews, Rall, Fosdick, Case, and Craig school of modern thought.

We repeat, Dr. Day does not represent Methodism in these lectures. He does not hesitate to be understood as one of the modern school of Methodists to whom the old Theology is very distasteful. He rather rejoices in that he has experienced disenchantment from the Theology of his youth, and openly confesses that it was Dr. Rauschenbusch who delivered him. He says: "Awakened from his dream of individualistic religion by the prophetic pages of Rauschenbusch, he soon found himself flung into the social conflict."

This makes me think of two Methodist preachers—Dr. Day and Hugh Price Hughes (of British Methodism). When Hughes left London University and entered the ministry, he had a first-class intellectual training; but he had a disdain for the vitally evangelical; he laughed revivalism to scorn, and could not but despise preachers of the Gospel, pure and simple, who led men to what was called *decision* there and then. He had adopted a literary and intellectual style and had become rather sardonic, and labored more for rhetorical effect than to win souls to Christ. Something happened to Hughes; it changed him, and he in turn changed Methodism in the British Isles. At Brighton a convention on the Deeper Life was conducted by Pearsal Smith and Mrs. Smith (author of *The Christian Secret of a Happy Life*.) There Hughes crossed the Rubicon which transformed him from a proud, sardonic intellectualist into an apostle of evangelism, and he set the British Conference on fire with a new message and method. The Forward Movement was instituted, and those great Central Halls of Evangelism were started all over England, where the people attended by the thousands to hear the Gospel.

With Dr. Day, the process is reversed. He did not begin his ministry like Hugh

Price Hughes with a contempt for evangelism. Dr. Day was schooled amid holiness teachings and revivalism, and his early ministry ran along those lines; but after the World War he took a turn to the left, obviously relinquishing the theology and tradition of his early years, and joining himself to that school of Methodist Modernists who have slowed down the advance of the Church, undermined its certainties, chilled its ardor, impaired its ideals, humanized its divinities and substituted human expedients for the Bible plan of salvation.

In this book Dr. Day seems to have left far behind the theology of the fathers and his Methodist traditions, and has taken into his system a strange mixture of Agnosticism, Socinianism, ancient Arianism and Modern Unitarianism. Evidently he has effaced from his theological horizon pretty near everything of real value that is related to the theology of Methodism to which he was pledged when he entered our ministry. It would seem that he is eminently qualified to cross over from Methodism to Unitarianism without having to change a single item of his creed. Dr. Edwin Lewis, of Drew University, whose knowledge of modern intellectual currents is second to no man's in the denomination, has well said: "A whole generation has been subjected to a type of preaching which was presumably Christian, and yet from which has been eliminated those very truths in which the Church began and by which it has been nourished and perpetuated, and by which alone it can long continue into the future."

Dr. Day's Yale lectures, from the standpoint of literature, are brilliant. They make interesting reading. Intellectually, he is as bright as *Day*; theologically, he is as opaque as *night*. His Christology is not that of evangelical theology; his history is not that of the sacred records; his Deity is not that of the Bible; his Jesus is not that of Paul and John, but that of Rall, Fosdick, Gougel, Bundy, Schweitzer, Case and Craig. Looking at the Bibliography at the back

f the book, one is reminded of that old aphorism: "Show me the company a man keeps, and I will tell you what kind of a man he is." Dr. Day's references are all to books of the liberalistic school. Scarcely an evangelical book is cited. Such a masterpiece as Canon Liddon's *Hampton Lectures on the Divinity of Christ* (given at Oxford) has no place in the list.

Said an eminent dialectician: "Religion was not given to enable us to complete our intellectual system, but that we might find peace in the will of God." A great deal of the writing and preaching and lecturing of our "modern prophets" would appear to make it out that our quest in the realm of religion should be primarily to adjust religion and its claims to our modern mode of thinking, thus casting into discard the older moulds. This idea seems to run, more or less, all through Dr. Day's book. In fact, it seems now to be a popular quest among certain intellectuals to devise some new scheme of salvation, so as to avoid the sanctions, conditions and moral requirements of the New Testament plan of redemption.

I shall now proceed to put in concrete form Dr. Day's theological positions on these points: The Incarnation, Virgin Birth, Person of Christ, Miracles, Atonement, Resurrection and Saviourhood of Jesus. These, if you please, may be called Dr. Day's *seven negations*.

The Incarnation. "In Him the raw stuff of our human nature was taken and refined and amplified and transcended until what was at the beginning a mere self became a fulfilled personality. . . . In Jesus, the supreme moral and spiritual genius, there is at once the revelation of and the inspiration to fulness of manhood."

"In the attempt to define the manner in which Jesus becomes the revelation of God, there has been much metaphysical speculation, much theological controversy, and sometimes a bitterness which has blasphemed the spirit of him whom we are attempting to describe. The human nature has been submerged in a

divine nature, or it has been described as existing side by side with the divine nature in one Person. Jesus has been made synonymous with God, it being affirmed that the Ruler of the Universe once became localized on this fragment of star-dust and lay as a babe in a manger."

The Virgin Birth. "Whether He was born of a virgin is a question upon which He never made comment, but it has been argued over and over that only one so born could be of much help to us, an argument which rates very meanly the process by which the rest of us came into the world, and by that very fact reduces us to a very low estimate."

The Atonement. "A great deal of unnecessary mystery and of insupportable theology have been woven about His death."

"Man's sin is not the violation of a code whose integrity must be preserved at all costs, but rather his failure to be a true son of his Father. God is neither eager nor bound to punish: the idea of punishment is obsolescent even among men. We do not punish offenders; we try to discover what is wrong with them and set them right. Even if God was a judge bent on punishment, the idea of transference of punishment is very difficult to connect with eternal justice. Jesus' death was not a judicial stroke: it came about very naturally as a result of the conflict between what Jesus was, and the selfishness of his contemporaries."

"Jesus died for men. . . . His death as His Life was His seal upon the worthfulness of human nature, and its unlimited possibilities. . . . His cross, the instrument of His shame, is His testimony to our essential glory."

"Historical research has convinced some that the great dream of His life was for His nation. . . . But His last week in Jerusalem mocked that vision, and left Him standing on the road toward Bethany as it wound around the hill looking back on the city and saying: 'O Jerusalem, how often would I . . . but ye would not.' It was the heartbreak

of a devastated dream. . . . He went to Jerusalem the very last week of His life in a bold effort to challenge the nation to accept His leadership and come back to their senses and to God; and even when He saw He must suffer and die, He did not despair. He believed in God. He accepted His sufferings and death as a part of the divine strategy."

"He entered upon a career of teaching which aroused the antagonism of the religious orthodoxy of His day and finally brought Him to a cross where He died on the spear-point of hatred for His rebuke of religious formalism and fanatical patriotism."

The Person of Christ. "The pastor of one of our largest churches appealed to me that I should not shy away from the Deity of Christ in these lectures. I have not used that phrase at any time during these lectures, and I cannot. It has so many confusing connotations."

"In an effort to understand Him, men, awed by His splendor, have lost sight of His human nature and have deified Him in such absoluteness that you and I have no share in Him. He has been presented as a revelation of God, not of man; the disclosure of what man is or may become. He is therefore not an inspiring ideal, but a discouraging apocalypse."

"In Jesus, the supreme moral and spiritual genius, there is at once the revelation of and the inspiration to fullness of manhood."

"He has been so entangled in the customs and habits of the thought of His contemporaries, and in the theologies and the world-views of His immediate followers that He has seemed inadequate for a scientific, socially minded generation and therefore incapable in Himself of being that Ideal to which the modern man can commit himself."

"That Jesus who has meant so much to him (Dr. Day) has not been the traditional Jesus of the unexamined record, nor the poetic Jesus of religion fantasy. It has been a Jesus who rose out of the record, who gradually bit by bit recreated Himself out of authentic word and assured deed; who grew by a process

of moral and spiritual assimilation, was at first a central core of indubitable fact, and then, like a magnet lighting iron filings out a pit of sand, selected out of accumulated stories about Him those which really belonged to Him and took them into Himself. I do not know how else one can recover a figure of such antiquity."

"His splendor is the splendor of our nature, His beauty is the beauty of a fulfilled personality. Jesus was a spiritual genius. . . . He was a prophet, and prophets arrive only occasionally. He was the Son of God in whom sonship had its most perfect realization—But genius and prophet and Son of God as He was nevertheless His was a human life. . . . He had the most of God which ever succeeded in pouring itself into a human being, but that most was still poured into a human being."

"This is the Jesus whom we preach, a definite historical figure whose teachings and character rise out of the dim past in clear and convincing outline and who comes to us to bring the good news of God and the sense of a living presence."

Resurrection. "Christ after His death in some fashion full of mystery to us convinced His disciples that He was not a dead prophet, but a living comrade and inspired them to launch a campaign for the salvation of the world."

His Miracles—The Supernatural. "The modern man, does not get his help from the traditional Jesus of the unexamined records, nor the poetic Jesus of religious fantasy. It has been a Jesus who rose up out of the records . . . who grew by a process of moral and spiritual assimilation. . . . Knowing the kind of Man He was, we can be rather sure that He did not destroy the herd of Gadarine swine, nor rebuff the Syrophenician woman who came to Him for help, nor curse a fig tree because it offered no fruit to his hunger, nor send a disciple down to the lake to find a fish with enough money to pay the temple tax."

"Events like the stilling of the angry sea, the feeding of the 5,000 with a

basket of food, the raising of the dead, are events which seem to the scientific mind a collection of fairy tales."

"The old ritual commanded the preacher to say at every wedding, 'which holy estate Christ adorned and beautified with His presence and first miracle which He wrought in Cana of Galilee.' We are a bit sensitive about that miracle, but we cannot deny that the story sounds very much like Jesus."

The Saviourhood of Jesus. "Jesus actually becomes a deliverer from moral failure."

"The Jesus of history offers counsel and inspiration to all struggling selves on their way to personality."

"There is none other name given under heaven, or among men, whereby we must be saved.' That affirmation, like many others found in the New Testament, has been made the authority for all sorts of intolerable theologies, for the religious disfranchisement of noble spirits in other religions, for the consignment to eternal torment of millions who in loyalty to their ancestors, or as a result of the training of childhood, sought God by some other way. . . . Our fathers used to proclaim Him as Saviour from the guilt of sin and the power of sin. Is He, or did the help which they apparently received from Him actually come from a theological fantasy?"

"That Ideal to which the modern man can commit himself and by which he can be unified and in which he can find himself."

"The theological Jesus of yesterday may not answer our needs, but the Jesus of history is still the Saviour of those who will live in spiritual fellowship with Him."

Having presented Dr. Day's positions in his own words and without comment, I ask your indulgence while I seek to evaluate his positions from the standpoint of history, and of the present pressing need of a confused and sin-burdened world.

Bishop Gore once said "that the learned class of every period has special resources and makes special claims

which the mass of men cannot share. It expects to attain religious truths from the vantage ground of its own rational process . . . and exhibits an abhorrence of distinctive tenets and creeds and specific corporate obligations."

As we read these pronouncements of Dr. Day on the great corporate and cardinal tenets of historic Christianity, we are tempted to ask the same question that John Wesley asked in his famous Oxford sermon on "Scriptural Christianity": "In the name of the Lord God Almighty, what religion are you of?"

And now a further quotation from Dr. Day: "Our Thesis has been that the Jesus of history in a unique and indispensable fashion offers counsel and inspiration to all struggling selves on their way to personality. . . . This momentous undertaking has brought me face to face with two difficult questions: What is the nature of Personality? Have we in Jesus an answer to the demand of Personality? . . . Historical research is still occupied with Jesus, and may have still greater wisdom for us who are eager to know more about this winsome, wonderful man; but both in psychology and history some results have been achieved . . . some of these results have found their way into these lectures and are submitted, not as tentative guesses, but as *discovered goods*."

Obviously the "discovered goods" to which Dr. Day refers are *second hand goods*! After reading the book twice, we failed to find a single new thing about Jesus. The supposedly "new things" and "new findings" are nothing but fallacies concerning Jesus which have been exploited by Modernists these many years and exploded by evangelical scholars time and again. For instance, Dr. Day joins Professor Rall in portraying Christ as being chiefly concerned with saving His own nation from impending disaster (and failed in doing so). His conception of Christ's ministry narrows Him down to a very limited field, abolishing that picture of Him as the World's Redeemer who came primarily to fulfil the Scriptures and to give His life a

ransom for a lost world; and this diminished Christ of Professor Rall and Dr. Day is not a historical figure. He is a creation of the unbelieving imagination of men who followed the narrow dogmatism of naturalistic philosophy in its confused repudiation of the supernatural. That whole point of view is now out of date. The new undeterminism of science has left it without foundation.

Dr. Day is contending for the "Jesus of history offering counsel and inspiration to struggling selves on their way to personality." In this we see Dr. Day substituting the idea of Jesus as assisting men to personality for the Biblical idea of salvation. Such a substitution is a perversion, not an improvement. It is not lack of personality that is defeating life. It is *sin*. Lack of personality does not lie at the root of moral failure. It is rather depravity. It is that man is neither organic in his own inner being nor organic in his social relations. He has personality enough, but it is divided and in frightful conflict. Conscience is arrayed against desire. He is self-centered, self-driven, with no adequate consciousness of the true society in which he must find his completion. Dr. Day seems to ignore the fact that man is also burdened with a sense of guilt and ill-desert. He is ashamed and afraid as he meets the issues of the soul and faces the mystery of the moral Infinite. The Scriptural term "salvation" precisely describes what he needs. Dr. Day's expression, "on the way to personality," is not only obscure, but is definitely out of contact with man's moral problem. This much, however, is clear. Jesus, in Dr. Day's thought and thesis, is not Humanity's Saviour. He is only our counselor and exemplar in our quest of completion and of social crusading.

From his view of Jesus as a Jewish patriot trying to save his nation, Dr. Day claims he makes a discovery which seems to give his followers a new charter and summons to social action, a new warrant for the social gospel. "A crusading Christ" he says, "demands a cru-

sading church." His interpretation of Christ's ministry as a crusade leads to a serious misinterpretation of His whole career, and obscures His redemptive mission for all mankind.

We are inclined to believe that Bart and his co-worker, Brunner, whom Dr. Day quotes disapprovingly, are right when they tell us that the "Social Gospel" as now preached will have the effect in a generation or so of "reducing the church to a protesting group of visionary fanatics, because the social and political world is much too far off from God really to be moved by protests, social programs, principles and ideals."

In the chapter on "The Ideal Person" Dr. Day gives us his portrait of Jesus, which is not, of course, the Christ of victorious Christian faith. This portrait is not the Christ of the Incarnation, the Christ of the Gospel record, the Christ of the crucifixion and resurrection. It is, instead, just a human imagination and idealism. He tells us where he got the figure; we quote: "The best men we know in Christendom today, men whose intelligence, character and social passion impel us to put on their heads the crown of leadership, are men who have painted their own portrait of Jesus out of the primary colors furnished them by the Gospels. . . . They could not surrender to a vague, mystical Jesus, nor could they have been saved by a composite figure constructed out of the indifferentiated mass of Gospel narratives. They have used their historical judgment, their moral discrimination, their spiritual insight to disentangle the real Jesus. . . . We ourselves have come to the conclusion that some things written about Him are not true, and we are glad that they are not."

Now what does this suggest? I think we can come to only one conclusion. That those men of modern thought have constructed their own Christ, not out of historic documents, but arbitrarily; and Dr. Day has chosen to follow them. He seems to have substituted a new authority for the old one; modern apostles, if we may so speak, for the Apostles of Jesus.

"The modern man," says Dr. Day, "does not get his help from the traditional Jesus of religious fantasy. It has been a Jesus who rose up out of the records . . . who grew by a process of moral and spiritual assimilation."

Two things strike us here, namely: according to Dr. Day, the Gospel records are not reliable; the miracles of the New Testament are not to be believed or accepted. Dr. Day writes as if the Gospel records have not been examined and scrutinized and critically studied till he and his fellow-critics took up the task. Such a claim is preposterous. Call the roll of the scholars from the days of Justin Martyr, Jerome, Origen, to the days of such modern men such as Tischendorf, Zahn, Bengel, Godet, Westcott, Hort, Liddon, Harnack, Denny, Orr, Robertson, Dick Wilson, Fitchett, Faulkner, Warfield, etc., and we find among them the most brilliant intellects, the greatest oriental scholars, the ablest Greek exegetes, the mightiest apologists—scores of them, hundreds of them, and in their examination and critical research of the Gospel records they have left nothing untouched; they applied the searchlight of truth to every item and left nothing to hearsay. There seems to be a frightful amount of intellectual arrogancy in these days and we plead guilty of having grown weary of it. Taking up Job's language (Job 12:2), we might say to them: "No doubt ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you."

Dr. Day himself makes no claim to scholarship such as that of the men whose names I have given. In original research he has had no experience, nor does he claim to have the equipment for it, he has merely absorbed the critical negations of others. Look at his bibliography, and you will readily see where he gets his beliefs and unbeliefs, his strange and false doctrines. Hardly an evangelical book is among them. The great masters in Bible scholarship are all wanting. His authorities seem all to be of the present-day liberal school, such

as Shailer Matthews, Rall, Coe, Pratt, Case, Scott, Dewey, etc.

Touching the Incarnation, Dr. Day has nothing to say in the language of historic Christianity. Paul said (1 Cor. 12:3): "No man can say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Ghost." In this whole series of lectures we fail to find a single reference to the Holy Spirit; we can not say whether Dr. Day has any doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

Put statement on the Person of Christ (quoted above) over against the language of Scriptures: "In the beginning was the word, and the word was God," "for in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily," "who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." "God hath in these last days spoken to us by his Son, who, being the brightness of his glory and the express image of his Person," "when He had purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high;" or put it over against the words of Clement of Rome: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Scepter of the Majesty of God;" or those of Origen: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, born of the Father before all Creation; born of the Virgin and the Holy Ghost; made incarnate while remaining God."

Dr. Day next proceeds to discuss the soteriological aspects of Christ's work, and asserts that by the church clinging to a doctrine of salvation through Christ's sacrifice, it has "thwarted" His ministry to personality and obscured His person. On this subject, Dr. Day's Christ is pitifully small, almost a trivial figure, when compared with Him in whom the thought and faith of the world has centered these two thousand years.

Sometimes Dr. Day drifts back a bit to his old position and to the things he once believed. Thus, in speaking of Henry Drummond, he says: "Beginning with a passion for Ruskin and Emerson and a great interest in geology, he encountered Dwight L. Moody; received a new birth and a new mission, became not a teacher of science, but a messenger of Christ." It was fortunate for Henry

Drummond that the Christ he accepted was the Christ of the Gospels, the Christ of the Cross, of the precious blood, the Christ of the old, simple Gospel preached by a man of the old school who brought thousands into the kingdom of God.

Then, again we catch an echo of the old school in these words: "The only hope of ever becoming . . . real sons of God is to have our human nature broken and humbled, and then utterly changed, born again by a new creative act of God." That's so! A little of that thrown in has Gospel flavor about it, but there is such an overwhelming amount of the other kind that our hopes soon disappear. Nevertheless, the orthodox presentation of Christ, according to the Scriptures, "has frightened men away," says Dr. Day, "that he has seemed utterly inadequate for a scientific, socially-minded generation, and therefore, incapable in himself of being that Ideal to which the modern man can commit himself, and by which he can be unified and in which he can find himself."

That is to say, the modern man needs a different kind of Christ from Him who was preached by the apostles, martyrs and saints of the ages. The Christ of Paul, Martin Luther, of Moody, is totally inadequate for this socially and scientifically minded age! Dr. Day never seems for a moment to have asked himself whether it might not be well that his point of view, rather than the historical viewpoint is what needs adjustment.

But Dr. Lewis has truly said: "Chris-

tianity means Supernaturalism. . . . No statement of Christian belief which does not include a supernatural reference is a true statement. Naturalism in philosophy spells the doom of Christianity because Christianity is the religion of the Supernatural."

I think that, as ministers of the Gospel, our souls should reach out more for the Supernatural—for the Christ of power and miracles.

The acceptance of the Christ of modern thought and of a reduced Jesus means a reduced Bible, hymn book and ritual. It would reduce our great hymns of redemption to useless poetry. It would mean taking every bit of essential meaning out of the sacraments. It would mean applying the knife to our New Testament and cutting therefrom all the great cardinal doctrines of our faith.

Have apostles and martyrs died in vain? Did they give their life-blood for a myth, a delusion and a fantasy? Must the testimony of the Church from the early fathers till our day be thrown to the winds?

Oh, ministers of the Gospel, need we be reminded again that the call of a needy and confused world is upon us? Too much of the religious thinking of our age has been negative, and the Church has suffered from a frightful invasion of strange doctrines. We have been shorn of our strength in consequence, and have met with defeat, not victory. Zion has been languishing. We hear again the sad cry: "Awake, awake, put on thy strength, O Zion!"

Haddon Heights, New Jersey.

Reviews of Recent Books

The Man who Said he Would, and Other Sermons. By William E. Biederwolf, D.D. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 234 Pearl St., Grand Rapids, Mich. \$1.00.

Dr. Biederwolf has many merits as a sermonizer. He commands a clear style that no one can misunderstand. He also puts things in a pointed and forcible way. He uses many illustrations, and

uses them pertinently. He gathers material from a great variety of sources, showing that he is a wide reader and a keen observer. He always chooses a text and develops, explains and applies its teaching in a practical way. The sermons in the present volume are characteristic. The man who said he would,

but wouldn't, was King Saul. The man who said he would, but couldn't, was Samson. The man who said he would, but didn't, was Peter, who failed to keep his promise of fidelity to Christ, but denied Him. The rest of the sermons of the book are just as original and compelling.

"Just Going To," and Other Sermons for Juniors. By Alfred J. Sadler, M.A. Fleming H. Revell Co., 158 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. \$1.50.

The practical value of these sermons has been tested by actual delivery to junior congregations. They created so much interest that many requests were made for their publication in book form. The result is this well-made volume. The initial sermon tells us about many people, sometimes grown-ups as well as boys and girls, who are "just going to do" a thing, but through lack of prompt action never get it done, and so never succeed in life. Mr. Sadler does not "talk down" to his boys and girls, and yet he knows how to say things in a way that they cannot help understanding. Many useful lessons are impressed upon young and receptive minds by practical sermons like these. They are model discourses of their kind.

Be of Good Cheer. By Herbert W. Bieber, D.D. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. Paper, 60c; cloth, \$1.

"Be of good cheer," said Jesus a number of times. In the Greek only one word is used—the word *Tharseō*, which Dr. Bieber happily translates by the new word, "Cheerio." Perhaps in colloquial language we would say, "Cheer up!" Well, into this handsome volume of sermons Dr. Bieber puts a lot of cheer. With him the gospel is really good news, and that of the most joyful kind. He knows how to rebuke sin; but he knows still better, how to encourage people with the gospel of love and holy joy. We would advise preachers, who are inclined to feel gloomy, and to put their gloom into their sermons, to read these cheery sermons and learn the fine art of looking on the bright side, and presenting it to their people.

General Evangeline Booth. By P. Whitwell Wilson. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, London and Edinburgh. \$1.00.

The story of the career of Evangeline Booth, General of the Salvation Army in the United States, reads like a romance, especially when it has been written up by such a literary artist as Mr. Wilson, the well-known author of many valuable books. Mr. Wilson also recites the history of the founding and progress of the Salvation Army. He also tells us many interesting things about General William Booth, the founder of the Salvation Army and the father of Evangeline. Mr. Wilson has much to say in praise of the Salvation Army and of the great work it has done in the rescue of men, women and children from sin and misery. Miss Booth is a woman of rare Christian grace, and has been endowed with many outstanding gifts. By all means, read this enthralling book.

The Educational Philosophy of Herman Bavinck. By Prof. Cornelius Jaarsma, Ph.D. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. \$2.50.

People who want to do tall thinking will relish this book. It is an analysis and estimate of the philosophy and educational conceptions of Dr. Herman Bavinck, the profound Dutch theologian and philosopher. In an interesting initial chapter the author gives a sketch of Dr. Bavinck's life. He had fine academic training for his great life-work. He even went to a liberalistic university in his native country, Holland, in order that he might know at first-hand just what the liberalists believed and taught. In this way he proved himself to be eminently fair. Yet he remained evangelical throughout his whole life, and died confessing his implicit faith in Jesus Christ.

And what was this great scholar's philosophy, according to the portrayal given in this book? We believe we can put it in a brief sentence: It was the philosophy of Christian Theism. Without believing in the Divine Being depicted in the Bible, no one can adequately account for the marvelous unity and

diversity of the universe; but with such a God subsumed, all the diversified phenomena of both the highest and lowest qualitative value can be adequately explained and accounted for. We think we have not mistaken Bavinck's fundamental philosophical thesis, although in this book many profound arguments are set forth, often in technical philosophical terms.

We are glad to note the following important points in Bavinck's philosophy and psychology. He was willing, if you permitted him to explain, to accept the philosophy of dualism—that is, that God and the cosmos are different entities, not to be consubstantiated in a pantheistic way; and yet in the personality of God and His purpose there is unity in the cosmos and harmony between it and its Creator. This unity our philosopher calls monism. Thus he would hold to dualism as to substance and monism as to purpose. Here is a fine sentence from our author (p.196) which sets forth one of Bavinck's fundamental principles: "Reality is both a unity and a plurality; (it) is characterized by oneness and manyness."

We are delighted to note that Bavinck was not an idealist in philosophy. He believed in the objective reality of the material universe, which is not merely a "form of thought," imposed upon the human mind. It is a real *noumenon* of which we sense and perceive the *phenomenon*. We also like his views on human psychology. Note this summation of his view given by our author (p.197): "Soul and body are distinct substances which find their unity in human personality as the image of its prototype, its original—God who is a Spirit." That is dualism in psychology; and yet the two substances, psychical and physical, are so constituted and integrated as to produce one personality—an admirable principle of both monism and dualism. And that, we hold, is the psychology which will explain the whole ambit of human experience. As to education, Dr. Bavinck held stoutly to the belief that man has diverse faculties (functioning

powers), and that all of them should be disciplined and developed in the educative process. In the face of opposition from materialistic philosophy, he stood fast always for the Christian faith. Yet he ever gave many and good reasons for his stalwart position. His temper was never that of the mere dogmatist.

This is quite a lengthy review, but it is all deserved, and a good deal more might well be said. The best thing for the interested reader to do is to get the book and read it for himself. It is an especially timely book in view of the divers kinds of philosophies and educational ideas current in our day. See this fine epigram: "The universe is a spacial-temporal embodiment of divine purpose" (p.200).

Four Girls and a Fortune. By Esther E. Enock. Pickering & Inglis, London, Glasgow and Edinburgh. 2s.

And now we turn from a profound book on philosophy to a story—a bright, wholesome, lightsome story. But it is not a frivolous piece of fiction. You will want to know what the four girls, who were sisters, did with the fortune that came to them so unexpectedly. To find that out you must read the story itself. For the most part it is a quiet story; still, it recites some three or four somewhat exciting incidents, some severe struggles of conscience, and several quite attractive romances. The Christian folks are wholesomely good, and do not belong to the "unco gude" sort.

I Go A-Fishing. By Rev. John McNeill, Pickering & Inglis, London, Glasgow and Edinburgh. One shilling.

These sermons bear the hall-mark of the famous Scotch preacher. They are typical. No one but John McNeill could have preached them and made them effective—but he could. There is not much that is homiletical about them, but they are expository and very practical. The great preacher knew how to apply the Word of God to the needs of the people. In this collection of his sermons he makes practical use of a number of incidents of the New Testament, and

sends his arrows straight home to their intended targets.

The Keswick Convention (1935). Published by Authority of the Council. Pickering & Inglis, London. Paper, 2s.6d.; cloth, 4s.

People who could not personally attend the Keswick convention of 1935 can now attend it in a very real sense by reading this important volume, made up of the addresses delivered there. This is at least next best to having been there in the literal sense. It certainly is a book of rich contents. All the addresses were revised carefully by the various speakers before they went to the print-shop. Their literary value, therefore, is of a high order. All the addresses are evangelical without being polemical in method of presentation. Many eminent names appear in the table of contents. Thus the reader may quietly read the thoughts of many of the best thinkers and most spiritually minded leaders of our day. If you want to experience "a season of refreshing from the presence of the Lord," get and read this choice volume.

The Revelation of St. John. By Abraham Kuyper, D.D., LL.D. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. \$2.50.

This monumental work by that great Dutch theologian and statesman, Abraham Kuyper, has been translated into smooth and readable English by John Henry de Vries, D.D. To give this treatise adequate treatment would require pages. We can only point out the learned author's main position. He holds the futurist view of the book of Revelation. The seven churches of Asia Minor, to whom John wrote at the dictation of the exalted Christ, were real churches; yet they were selected because they were typical of the spiritual condition of the churches during the whole historical period from our Lord's ascension to His second coming. The rest of the book from Chap. IV is prophetic of the consummation and the second coming of our Lord. The definite signs of His coming are in the future and will probably not be long-continued. It is interesting

to note how the author deals with the twenty-four elders, the four living creatures, the seven seals, the seven trumpets, and all the other symbolism of this wonderful book of the Bible. We know full well that many interpreters will not agree with Dr. Kuyper, but we can assure our readers that, if they are interested in the subject, they will find the scholarly author's arguments worth considering. We call attention to his treatment of the twentieth chapter of Revelation. After all, the author is right in surmising that there are many things in Biblical prophecy that are mystifying to us now, but which will all be made perfectly clear at the time of their fulfillment.

Bible History References. (Vol. II). By Rev. F. Rupprecht. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. \$2.75.

Some time ago we reviewed Volume I, which dealt with Old Testament history. The present volume recites and amplifies New Testament history. The author rightly holds that the New Testament recites true history as far as it goes. However, he gives more than mere Biblical history, but links it up with other historical facts and events as far as they are known. The work has many merits. It is invaluable to teachers of Bible history in parish schools, Sunday schools, Saturday and summer schools and catechetical classes. There are frequent references throughout to Luther's catechism and the hymn-book of the Church. There are pictures, charts, maps, a table of Bible weights, measures, etc., and archæological notes, all of which are valuable helps to both the teacher and the pupil. A pronouncing glossary and a full topical index are valuable features. All in all, the book is just what the evangelical Bible teacher needs in order to make his or her teaching effective for instruction and spiritual culture.

For Better, not for Worse. By Prof. Walter A. Maier, Ph.D. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. \$2.00.

On his title-page the author modestly calls this work "A Manual of Christian

Matrimony." But, estimating it by its size (504 large pages) and its scholarly character, it would, we think, better be called a "treatise." In a constructive way the author sets forth the Biblical teaching regarding the marital relation, showing clearly that it is pure monogamy. Polygamy and polyandry are shown to be utterly anti-Biblical as well as harmful and ethically wrong. He also deals with the question of the permanency of the marriage contract, and shows what is the only Scriptural ground for divorce. On the critical side, he exposes the sinister conceptions of marriage and sexual relations so often paraded today by would-be liberalists, like Bertrand Russell and Judge Lindsey. The former has carried out his principles into practical life, for his wife, Dora Russell, has now been divorced. Dr. Maier has gone into his subject in a thoroughgoing way, and has made much real research, having read many writers on the subject of the relation of the sexes to each other. The work should be read by both married and unmarried people. If young people would read and heed it, many unhappy alliances would be avoided. We hope this monumental work will have a larger circulation, and will exercise a correspondingly large influence for good. It is a most informing treatise.

The Way of the Orient. By Edward E. Richardson, Ph.D. The Judson Press, Philadelphia, Pa., Chicago, Los Angeles. \$1.00.

Dr. and Mrs. Richardson travelled together around the world. In the first chapter she furnishes the "Travelog," which is written in a chatty and engaging style. Then Dr. Richardson takes up the story and gives an able and interesting discussion of Hinduism, Buddhism, Mohammedanism, and touches somewhat on Confucianism. He shows clearly that Christianity should not be compromised with other religions, as it is the sole religion given to the human family by divine revelation, and sets forth the only way of pardon and salvation. No other religion presents a Saviour

who has made expiation for the sins of the world. At the same time the author frankly acknowledges the truths that are to be found in the ethnic faiths, and indicates the kindly spirit in which missionary work should be carried on. The missionary should be gentle and firm and should present the claims of Christianity in a constructive way.

The Problem of Lutheran Union and Other Essays. By Prof. Theodore Graebner, D.D. Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo. \$1.25.

Any person, of whatever denomination, who is interested in the history of American Christianity should get, read, and ponder this book. It is written with rare ability and insight, as one would expect from its scholarly author. All his statements are well documented, giving the reader confidence in the author's honesty and accuracy. According to this book, the day of general Lutheran union in this country is still beyond the remotest horizon. There are too many barriers in the way; too much difference of opinion and practice. For example, Dr. Graebner, sad to say, finds too much leaning toward Modernism among some of the leaders in the United Lutheran Church. The other Lutheran bodies—or at least most of them—cannot join with an ecclesiastical organization which, they think, contains and tolerates such liberalistic theologians and church leaders. The present writer desires gently to suggest another obstacle to Lutheran union, and this time it exists in the Missouri Lutheran Synod herself: we refer to her peculiar doctrine of predestination or election, on agreement with which she insists as a condition of even co-operation and fellowship, to say nothing of organic union. As long as such differences exist, we think the Lutheran people can do more for the kingdom of God in separate organizations than if they were all in one ecclesiastical body. Dr. Graebner's other papers in this collection are of much value, especially those under the titles: "As Others See Us," "The English Bible Up to

date" and "The Mendacity of Modernism." The last two are of general interest. We wish everybody could read them.

Teaching the Bible Story. By Prof. Alfred Schieding, M.A. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 75 cents.

The best methods of teaching Bible history and the Bible stories to children and young people are here set forth in a detailed and technical way. The author himself is a teacher of much practical experience. He is Professor of Education in Concordia Teachers' College, River Forest, Ill., an institution of the Lutheran Synodical Conference. The book might well be called a manual of Christian pedagogy. Pupils taught according to the instructions given in this handbook will not only remember the stories of the Bible ever afterward, but will also be impressed with the religious truths conveyed by them. If you are a teacher, and want to master the technique of your vocation, get this book.

These Sixty Years: The Story of the Keswick Convention. By Walter B. Sloan. Pickering & Inglis, 14 Paternoster Row, E.C.4, London, England. 2s.6d.

What is known as the Keswick movement is notable throughout the Christian world. As a distinct institution it was found in 1875, and is this year celebrating the sixtieth year of its establishment. It had a couple of predecessors in conventions at Oxford and Brighton; but its real founding was, as has been indicated, in 1875 at Keswick, England. The distinct things for which it stands may be expressed in several ways: to cultivate "Scriptural holiness"; to deepen the spiritual life; to achieve "full surrender" to Christ. According to the gripping narrative of Mr. Sloan's book, many eminent men, although they were regenerated, found, in going to the Keswick meetings, that they needed a fuller surrender to Christ, a more satisfying experience and a greater endowment of power. Many men of international fame have spoken on the Keswick platform, and have contributed to its world-wide

influence. The United States have furnished many noted speakers for the convention. The original Keswick has been the means and incitement for the establishment of many similar conventions in many parts of the world. Any one who desires to know just what Keswick stands for should secure this informing and well-written book.

Some Old Testament Parables. By Dr. J. Stewart Holden. Pickering & Inglis, London, Glasgow and Edinburgh. One shilling, net.

The first four chapters of this book give a treatment of four Old Testament parables, while the rest of the eleven chapters deal with New Testament principles. Dr. Holden has passed to his eternal reward. The contents of this book consist of the addresses he gave at conventions in England shortly before his death. As was usual with Dr. Holden, he treats the faults of Christian people somewhat trenchantly; but he speaks plainly for their own good, so that they may amend their lives and deepen their experiences. A picture of Dr. Holden displays his kindly and expressive countenance.

The Cross of Christ. By James H. Todd. The Bible Institute Colportage Association, 843-845 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill. Paper, 20 cents.

Although this is only a paper-bound book, it is worthy of a major notice. Mr. Todd has proven himself to be a true and profound theologian in this contribution to the rich literature extant on the atonement. He does not merely skim the surface. He shows that the death of Christ was not merely the death of a martyr to a noble cause, but that it was necessary in the divine plan of redeeming love and grace; it was voluntary, vicarious, propitiatory, reconciling, truly atoning, substitutional. By His active and passive obedience our Lord truly suffered the penal consequences of man's sins, and thereby satisfied and upheld the eternal principle of justice. Thus He could be just and

yet justify those who believe on Him. This is the only doctrine that proves the true sacrificial love of God for the sinning and suffering race.

The Triumph of John and Betty Stam. By Mrs. Howard Taylor. China Inland Mission, 237 West School Lane, Philadelphia, Pa.; 150 St. George Street, Toronto 5, Canada. Paper, 40 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

Only true Christian believers can call the untimely death of John and Betty Stam a "triumph." But Mrs. Taylor is correct in so designating it. For the two young missionaries their martyrdom was only a triumphant transference to the life everlasting. For the cause of missions it affords additional incentive to brave hearts. The story of the life and cruel death of Mr. and Mrs. Stam is grippingly told in this volume. Then there was the rescue of their baby, little Helen, whom they had to leave behind; the book tells in a thrilling way how she was rescued. The devotion of these martyrs to the cause of Christ will be an inspiration to many people in both the home field and the foreign field.

Waiting for the Coming. By J. T. Mawson. Pickering & Inglis, London, Glasgow and Edinburgh. Two shillings.

Another book on the second coming of our Lord. Three fundamental reasons are given to prove why He will come again: first, He has promised to come; second, the divine purpose would be incomplete if He did not come; third, His love demands that He should come. Then the author deals with "The Rapture and the Appearing." He also answers the question: "Will all who are Christ's be caught up at His coming for His saints?" Many other problems connected with our Lord's second advent are treated in an effective way.

They That Sow. By Mary Warburton Booth. Pickering & Inglis, London, Glasgow and Edinburgh. 3s.6d.

A kind of pathos marks this book. It is made up of sketches of missionary work in India, giving the personal experiences of the author and her companions. They felt great joy in pro-

claiming Christ to the people and giving them the Word of God; yet the greatness and difficulties of the work, and the sufferings of the people filled their lives with constant sadness. They could, in many cases, do nothing but sow the seed, without seeing much harvest to reap; and had to hope that the reaping would come in due time. The motto of the workers was, "They that sow in tears shall reap in joy."

The Forty Days of Musa Dagh. By Franz Werfel. Translated from the German by Geoffrey Dunlop. The Viking Press, New York. 1934. Pp. 824.

The sight of Armenian children, maimed and famished-looking, at work in a carpet factory in Damascus, led the author to make his investigations and write this book. Some of his material was derived from historical records of a conversation between Enver Pasha and Pastor Johannes Lepsius. It is reproduced, and another interview of Dr. Lepsius with a Turkish society standing for good will is also introduced. These latter Turks condemn the treatment given the Armenians, but are helpless to prevent it.

When an Armenian officer in the Turkish army was not called to the colors, and finally realized that the Turkish policy of transportation really meant extermination for his race, he decided to resist. His grandfather had acquired some wealth and had built his house on the side of a mountain. That mountain was the place chosen for the defense. The hero, Gabriel Bagradian, planned its defense well. His people had many rifles concealed by chance instead of being surrendered, and a clever mechanic was found who could repair rifles and manufacture ammunition. Summoned to gather for transportation, they refused, were attacked by a Turkish army, and drove their assailants back down the mountain in confusion and astonishment. When cannon were brought up to shell the place, a troop of boys surprised the guards at midnight, captured the cannon, made such a rumpus that the

men came to the scene, and then helped them drag the guns up the mountain-side for use against the Turks.

The picture presented of both Turks and Armenians is the most vivid yet seen in modern accounts, and the book should be read by all Christian leaders who would have a realistic understanding of what has happened in Turkey in recent years. Good Turks and bad Turks, good Armenians and bad Armenians, stupid men and women and keen men and women, strange graveyard dames, a faithless wife, an American of Greek and French parentage who is a renegade, an American consul of excellent character, and many others stand out sharply in the pages and help the reader to understand many things.

When all seemed lost after some terrible disasters, a French cruiser appeared on the scene, shelled the Turkish camp, and drove the Turks to retreat. The fleet soon arrived and carried off the surviving Armenians, all but one. The hero delayed too long, fell asleep, and was shot by the Turks.

The Turks certainly do not approve of the position taken in *Rethinking Missions*; for the book tells how they condemn American missionaries as the cause of all the trouble, including, evidently, the massacres! They taught the Armenians how to improve their condition, the latter gained wealth, became arrogant or not properly subservient, and the Turks felt compelled to put them in their proper place, since they were the masters and meant to remain so. This is a new version of the situation, and it is suggestive.—*H. W. Magoun.*

The Prophetic Character of the Psalms. By E. Bendor Samuel. Pickering & Inglis, London, Glasgow and Edinburgh. 2s.6d.

All evangelical believers hold that there is a large prophetic element in the Psalms. While many of the inspired writers may have referred to facts in their own time and experiences, yet the author of this instructive book speaks truly when he says (p. 14): "Like all the other books of the Bible, the Psalms

find their highest and completest realization in the Lord Jesus Christ. Many of the chief features of His career are predicted in the Psalms." Then he proceeds to point out many of the wonderful fulfillments. We call attention to only a few of them: Our Lord's advent and purpose in Psalm 40:6-8; His deity and humanity in Ps. 45:6, 7; His sonship and birth in Ps. 2:7; His creatorship and eternal existence in Ps. 102:25-28; His human descent in Ps. 89; His eternal priesthood in Ps. 110:4; His pre-eminence over earthly kings in Ps. 72:11; and so on. All these features and many others are searchingly developed in this useful volume. An illuminating chapter is added on the so-called imprecatory Psalms, showing that the Psalmist was not expressing a resentful and vindictive feeling, but was, through divine inspiration, announcing God's judgments against the wicked and impenitent.

My Work. By Revs. O. Fred Nolde and Paul J. Hoh. The United Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa. Paper, 25 cents.

Here we have another book in "The Lutheran Leadership Course," belonging to the more elementary series. There are in it many valuable suggestions and directions for the church worker. If he will follow all these rubrics, he certainly will be an efficient laborer in the Lord's vineyard. We must admonish the authors, however, to step more carefully and firmly in telling church workers how we got our Bible, or how the Bible was produced. On pages 15-19 they seem to over-emphasize the human element and say very little about the divine element. They also seem to attribute the Bible to human experience. We would remind them that such experience is not the primal source of the Bible. The primal source is God and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. As to the writer's "experience," the question arises, Whence did it come? That question should always be stated plainly, not uncertainly, in depicting the origin of the Word of God. Perhaps the authors thought it was im-

plied; but in these critical days it should be clearly stated. Moreover, God, through the Bible, has revealed many things which the human writers *could* not have experienced, as, for example, the history of the creation given in the first chapter of Genesis, nearly all the events of which took place before any human beings had come into existence. According to her doctrinal basis (see her constitution), "The United Lutheran Church in America receives and holds the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the inspired Word of God," etc. (literally quoted).

The Bible of the Expositor and Evangelist. (Vols. 18 and 19, Old Testament). By William B. Riley, D.D. Union Gospel Press, Cleveland, Ohio \$1.00 per volume.

Dr. Riley always writes in a pithy and pellucid style. His literary productions are always racy and readable. In Volume 18 he gives an exposition, always with practical applications, of the Minor Prophets,—Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah and Haggai. Volume 19 deals with the prophecies of Zechariah and Malachi, thus completing the author's notable series on the Old Testament. Dr. Riley exhibits much skill and astuteness in applying the teaching of the Holy Scriptures to the needs of the people of today. He does this in such a natural way as to make the Bible seem like a very modern book. His incidents and references are drawn from a great variety of sources, proving his mind to be constantly on the alert for practical material. What a treasure-house of useful information his forty volumes on the Bible will be when they are completed!

Future Events Revealed. By David L. Cooper, Th.M., Ph.D. Biblical Research Society, 4417 Bernice Street, Los Angeles, Calif. \$1.25.

Many books on Biblical prophecy are now coming from the press. Frankly, one's head almost becomes dizzy with the diversity of prophetic interpretation. However, one of the most consistent and scholarly expositors of prophecy is Dr. David L. Cooper, the author of this volume. He gives a keen analysis of

Matthew 24 and 25, collated with other relevant passages of Scripture. Acquainted with both the Hebrew and the Greek, he is able to discern the finest shades of meaning in both the Old and New Testaments. His argument for his views is finely elaborated, and is abetted with many quotations from the Bible. He believes in "taking every word (of Scripture) in its primary, ordinary, literal meaning, unless the facts of the context indicate otherwise." That is his cardinal rule of Biblical interpretation.

Bible Studies. By Albert Ervine, Thynne & Co., Ltd., 28-30 Whitefriars Street, Fleet Street, London, E.C. 4, England. 2s.

Here we have a good book, albeit a somewhat puzzling one. The author is concerned with two vital subjects: first, the Word of God; second, the Person of Christ. On the inspiration of the Bible he seems to be thoroughly sound; but he rejects the statement that "the Bible is the Word of God," and accepts the statement that "the Bible contains the word of God." His argument is as follows: Not all of the Bible is the Word of God, because some of it is the words of Satan, as, for example, when he tempted our first parents; some parts of the Bible are also mistaken human words, like the arguments of Job's would-be advisers. Of course, Mr. Ervine holds that the Biblical writer was so inspired that he reported accurately the statements of Satan and Job's counselors. Thus the author seems to make good his contention that the whole Bible is not the Word of God. Yet we must add that the expression, "The Bible contains the Word of God," is fraught with danger; it is regarded with favor by the liberalists, for they can say, "Of course, the Bible contains the Word of God—but it contains much else, besides, and much, too, that is not the divine Word." So we suggest that the statement, "The Bible is the Word of God," be retained, with the understanding that the Biblical writers were divinely inspired to report correctly just what God wanted reported. In the second part of

is book the author cogently upholds the true deity and humanity of our Lord. Still he has some peculiar ideas of the doctrine. Thus the book is somewhat unique, and is adapted to challenge thought, even if one cannot endorse all its statements.

What is Life? By W. J. Still. Thynne & Company, Ltd., 28-30 Whitefriars Street, London, E.C.4, England. 3s.6d.

The author does not answer his question by defining life—no one can do that—but he does describe its varied phenomena in a clear and learned way. He treats first of the inorganic kingdom, then of the organic. There are, according to the author, three kinds of life, vegetable, animal, and psychical or spiritual. The last is the most important, enabling its possessor to form character, which is the final goal of the whole program and purpose of the cosmos. In analyzing the condition of the world today, materially, morally and spiritually, the author comes to the right conclusion that its only hope lies in the acceptance and practice of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Although made up of a number of miscellaneous chapters, which do not always seem to have much logical connection, yet the book is a most suggestive one.

Thus Saith the Lord. By Samuel Vanden Hoer. The Scriptures Publishing Society, 1624 Cleveland Ave., Grand Rapids, Mich. Paper, 75 cents; cloth, \$1.00.

If you are looking for unity of theme or a system of doctrine, you will not find it in this book; but if you are in search of a promiscuity of important truths, always based on a "Thus saith the Lord," then this is the book you will want to get. By "Thus saith the Lord" the author always means the Bible, which he regards as divinely inspired throughout, and not only in spots. What is the message of the Lord to you? The Bible tells you. How can you know what that message is? Search the Scriptures. What are God's commandments and exhortation? Again you must turn to the Word of God. And so on throughout the book.

The Book of Revelation. By William R. Newell. The Scripture Press, Chicago, Ill., 1935. 404 pp. \$1.75.

This volume presents a study of the Apocalypse of St. John from the standpoint of the futuristic interpretation. Part I, embracing Revelation 1-20, treats of "Judgment"; Part II, covering Revelation 21 and 22, deals with the "New Creation." In addition, there are four appendices, which provide a discussion of special themes. Appendix I deals with "Second Coming" Hymns of Dark Ages"; II, with "Elders"; III, with "Idolatry"; IV, with "Bullergerism" and "Why the Church will not be in the Great Tribulation."

Although the author does not approach the study of the book from the scientific point of view, and hence does not relate it properly to the historic period which gave it birth, he, nevertheless, provides numerous fresh interpretations and suggestions which will prove helpful to those who hold futuristic views. He uses the Revised Version of the Bible, but occasionally paraphrases it to bring out what seems to be the true meaning. Here and there he refers to the significance of the original Greek words, indicating that he is not without the ability to translate for himself. To him Revelation appears to be "the only divine and accurate account of present and future things." The symbols employed in the book have, for the most part, a literal significance. In every instance they have a future reference, irrespective of the fact that John was facing a very definite crisis in the latter days of Emperor Domitian, who sought to impose Caesar-worship upon all his subjects at the price of martyrdom. The book will find a ready response in many minds.—*Prof. Elmer E. Flack, Th.D.*

Modern Discoveries which Help us to Believe. By George McCready Price, M.A. Fleming H. Revell Co., 158 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. \$1.50.

If you want to read a book which presents "many infallible proofs" of the divine inspiration and authority of the Bible, this is the book to get. Professor

Price in this book, as well as in his previous volumes, reveals a technical knowledge of the various branches of physical science, including geology, paleontology, biology, chemistry and physics. He seems to be as much at home among the atoms (if there are such entities) as among the fossils and the various strata of the earth. In addition, he is a diligent student of the Bible, and is conversant with the Biblical criticism of the past and the present. All this store of knowledge he has laid on the altar of consecration to the defense of the Holy Scriptures. In many ways he shows how the various sciences agree with the teaching of the Bible. His chapters on archæology and its relation to the Bible are most informative. He clearly exposes the scientific inadequacy of the hypothesis of evolution. On one matter, however, we must beg leave to differ from our good friend, who seems to hold that the believer's soul does not go to paradise immediately after death, but must wait for the resurrection of the body in order to possess consciousness. Some intimations on the Old Testament Sabbath also seem to us to be irrelevant to his apologetic for the divine character of the Bible. Otherwise this volume is a masterful and convincing presentation of the evidences of Christianity.

- **A Tudor Heroine.** By Beth J. Coombe Harris. John Ritchie, Ltd., Pubs., Surrock St., Kilmarnock, Scotland.

There are several heroes and heroines in this interesting story. It is laid in the time of the Tudors in England in the sixteenth century, during the wicked reign of Queen Mary, when Protestants were so bitterly persecuted, many of them being burned at the stake or otherwise put to death. Several of the characters in the book are real historical personages. One character has a terrific struggle with a smiting conscience for defrauding other people of their rights. How the plot is unravelled—well, the best way to find that out is to read the book. It would be spoiled to be disclosed here.

Hopeless—Yet There is Hope. By Arno C. Gaebelein, D.D. Publication Office "Our Hope," 456 Fourth Ave., New York, N. Y. \$1.00.

It is always worth while to read a book by Dr. Gaebelein. With much detail, many quotations from numerous sources, and strong argumentation, he shows, in this his latest book, that the civilizations of the world are on the decline, that everything is in a chaotic state, and that we are approaching a crisis. He holds that there is no help from human sources, no matter how worldly wise our statesmen and economists may be. Dr. Gaebelein does not hesitate to criticise our present administration. He also pays his respects to the Modernism of our day and the theory of evolution, and holds them partly responsible for the dismal condition of affairs. So far as regards human sources of help, the world is hastening to destruction. Even the peace efforts of the nations will finally prove to be of no avail. All this dark portrayal is in Part I of the book. Part II depicts the author's conception under the title, "Yet There is Hope." And what is that hope? As might be expected from our author, it is the glorious second coming of Christ. Dr. Gaebelein closes his book with this fervent prayer: "Even so come, Thou Hope of the hopeless, Thou Hope of Israel, Thou Hope of the world, of all nations and of the whole Creation! Even so come, Lord Jesus."

Additional Literary Notes

The author of a recent liberalistic book speaks about what he calls "the bankruptcy of Christian Apologetics." We do not think that this claim exhibits up-to-date information. Recently the writer of these notes prepared the manuscript for the sixth edition of his work, entitled **A System of Christian Evidence**. In doing this he collected a list of cogent books on Christian Apologetics of a conservative character which have been published in America and England since the fifth edition was issued in the fall of 1930; and how many do you

suppose he found that had come to his notice? Over two pages of typewritten manuscript. In the fifth edition of this treatise he had published a bibliography of apologetic works (conservative) covering 31 pages. Even then he was compelled to omit a number of cogent and helpful pamphlets in defense of some parts of the Christian system of truth. In the face of these facts, is a man well posted who talks about "the bankruptcy of Christian Apologetics"?

But we must not think that the battles won for evangelical Christianity. Just note the number of modernistic and semi-modernistic books that have been published within the last two or three years. A very outstanding work of the Graf-Wellhausen-Driver cast has been written by two theological professors on Old Testament Introduction. Another book with decidedly liberalistic tendencies on the Old Testament has come from an unexpected source—a source that should by all means be conservative. Shailer Mathews' last work, *Creative Christianity*, modernistic as ever, has come from the press within the present year.

Of Dr. Mathews' book an evangelical reviewer has this to say:

If the author (Mathews) knows anything of the divine origin of the Christian religion, we have not discovered a trace of it in this book. . . . If the learned author knows anything of the regenerating work of the Holy Spirit, of the divine operations through the Word and sacraments, of saving faith in the vicarious Redeemer, Jesus Christ, the book does not show it.

Reference has frequently been made in these columns to the important work of Professor A. S. E. Yahuda. He has been taking part in some important conferences in England on the part of conservative believers, and his scholarly testimony has been of great value to the cause of the evangelical faith. A reporter of one of the said conferences expresses hearty thanks "to Dr. Yahuda, that great Hebrew and Egyptian scholar, for showing that only a Hebrew who had lived in Egypt and knew Egyp-

tian language and customs, could have written the Pentateuch." That is strong testimony from one who knows whereof he affirms.

Those of us who have never had any experience in translating the Bible into a pagan language are not aware of the difficulties and problems met with in such work. An enlightening pamphlet, bearing the title, *The Chinese Term Question*, by Rev. George O. Lilligard, deals with at least one of these problems—that of choosing the right word for God in the Chinese language. A good deal of controversy has occurred relative to that question. The author holds that only one term for God in the Chinese language should be used to correspond to *Elohim* in the Hebrew of the Old Testament and to *Theos* in the Greek of the New Testament. He holds that it is wrong to translate those terms by the term *Shang Ti*, which is a specific name. He holds that the proper term is *Shen*. To our mind, the author sets forth strong reasons for his contention. This pamphlet may be gotten of the Christian Book Room, 3 Quinsan Gardens, Shanghai, China, or of the author, 14 Kingsboro Park, Jamaica Plain, Mass. Price, 15 cents.

In a dainty booklet, entitled *Eight Things That Matter*, Dr. W. Graham Scroggie develops and enforces the following vital matters pertaining to the Christian faith and life: assurance of salvation, yieldedness to God, knowledge of the Bible, power in prayer, missionary-mindedness, specific service, Christian stewardship, and spiritual fellowship. As is his wont in all his writings, he states truth in a pointed and pithy way. The booklet is published by Pickering & Inglis, London. Price, 6d.net.

A number of tracts and booklets, all of them deserving of mention, have come to hand. We can give them only brief notices:

Who is the Christ? which is the second part in booklet form of Albert Ervine's valuable book, *Bible Studies*, reviewed

elsewhere in this magazine; published by Thynne & Co., London. Price, 3d.

Why Modernism is "The Apostasy." By Rev. Roy L. Aldrich. Central Bible and Tract Depot, 703 Fine Arts Building, Detroit, Mich. A trenchant *exposé* of Modernism. Price not given.

How I Came to Believe in Our Lord's Return and Why I Believe the Lord's Return is Near (in one booklet). By a number of outstanding Biblical scholars, all of them very sincere and earnest. The Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago. 5 cents each; 40 cents per dozen; \$2.75 per hundred.

This is the Victory. By Janie Langford. A beautiful story for young people, showing what faith can do in transforming character. Thynne & Co., London. 4d.

The following choice booklets come from our enterprising friends, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.:

Home-spun, by Olive P. Katz. This is a unique little book—really an original idea worked out in a fine way. The author quotes the Mother Goose rhymes and jingles, and then draws from them lessons for every-day use. All members of the family, whether young or old, little or big, will be delighted with this booklet. Price, 40c.

Next comes a booklet of poems, entitled, **Beauty for Ashes**, by Prof. W. G. Polack, of Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Mo. Well, we like real poetry—written verse that has something more about it than mere rhythm, meter and rhyme, something which you can feel but cannot define, except to say that it is a spirit and an atmosphere which is poetry. Prof. Polack's poems are of this character. They have the right jingle, and reveal the poetical temper and distinction. He calls some of his poems "sacred" and others "secular," but we are bound to say that all of them breathe the spirit of genuine poesy. We are tempted to quote some choice stanzas, but prefer that you

should get the book and read all the poems. Price, 40c.

Here is a booklet from the same publishers which is written to instruct and indoctrinate: **The One and the Many**, by R. J. Danhof. It aims to present, as the author says, "a brief of Calvinistic contribution on the American social problem." The author holds to the Calvinistic system of faith, and believes that its application to our many social problems will bring about the most salutary results. The brochure is surely worth getting and reading. Price, 25c.

An earnest Christian polemic, entitled **Rightly Dividing the Scriptures**, by George R. Brunk, comes to our desk from *The Sword and Trumpet*, Fentress, Virginia. It advocates what the author calls "Gospel Synergism"—that is, "God's part and man's part in salvation." The pamphlet upholds the Arminian doctrine over against Monergism—that is, that man has no part in his salvation. Calvinism is stoutly opposed; also the doctrine that man is justified solely by faith. The author argues in this way (p. 37):

If saving faith depended entirely upon God, then all would receive it, for it is not God's will that any should perish. If saving faith depended entirely upon man, then no one could have it, for man can live and move and think and choose only by the powers that God has given him.

We are merely giving the author's theological views. Those who are interested in this debate, will, no doubt, want to get this earnest pamphlet. Single copies, 10c.; 90c. per doz copies.

The unique title of a booklet from Pickering & Inglis, London, Glasgow and Edinburgh, is, **The Morning! The Night Also**, which is meant "for boys—and others," according to the title-page. Its contents are made up of intimate and pleasing talks to boys and their friends. The author is W. J. Maddox, who is willing to answer questions that will be helpful to boys if they will address him at 24 Southfield Road, Cotham, Bristol, England. Price, 6d.